Y 4. R 31/3: 104-1

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM REFORM ACT

GOVDOC
Y4.R 31/3:104-1

1023-A

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS, AND LANDS

OF THE

RETAIN 5 YEARS ONLY
ANNEX

COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 260

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PLAN AND A MANAGEMENT REVIEW OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM AND TO REFORM THE PROCESS BY WHICH AREAS ARE CONSIDERED FOR ADDITION TO THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

FEBRUARY 23, 1995

Serial No. 104-1

DEPOSITORY
MAY 16 1995
PAPPAS LAW LIBRARY

Printed for the use of the Committee on Resources

DEC 28 2000

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
89-593 CC WASHINGTON : 1995

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-047027-7

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM REFORM ACT

GOVDOC
Y4.R 31/3:104-1

1023-A

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS, AND LANDS

OF THE

RETAIN 5 YEARS ON ANNEX

COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FOURTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

H.R. 260

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PLAN AND A MANAGEMENT REVIEW OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM AND TO REFORM THE PROCESS BY WHICH AREAS ARE CONSIDERED FOR ADDITION TO THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

FEBRUARY 23, 1995

Serial No. 104-1

DEPOSITORY
MAY 16 1995
TAPPAS LAW LIBRARY

Printed for the use of the Committee on Resources

DEC 28 2000

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
89-593 CC WASHINGTON : 1995

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-047027-7

COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES

DON YOUNG, Alaska, *Chairman*

JAMES V. HANSEN, Utah
JIM SAXTON, New Jersey
ELTON GALLEGLY, California
JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR., Tennessee
JOEL HEFLEY, Colorado
JOHN T. DOOLITTLE, California
WAYNE ALLARD, Colorado
WAYNE T. GILCHREST, Maryland
KEN CALVERT, California
RICHARD W. POMBO, California
PETER G. TORKILDSEN, Massachusetts
J.D. HAYWORTH, Arizona
FRANK A. CREMEANS, Ohio
BARBARA CUBIN, Wyoming
WES COOLEY, Oregon
HELEN CHENOWETH, Idaho
LINDA SMITH, Washington
GEORGE P. RADANOVICH, California
WALTER B. JONES, JR., North Carolina
WILLIAM M. (MAC) THORNBERRY, Texas
RICHARD (DOC) HASTINGS, Washington
JACK METCALF, Washington
JAMES B. LONGLEY, Maine
JOHN B. SHADEGG, Arizona
GEORGE MILLER, California
NICK J. RAHALL II, West Virginia
BRUCE F. VENTO, Minnesota
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
SAM GEJDENSON, Connecticut
BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico
PETER A. DEFAZIO, Oregon
ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
TIM JOHNSON, South Dakota
NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii
GERRY E. STUDDS, Massachusetts
W.J. (BILLY) TAUZIN, Louisiana
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
CALVIN M. DOOLEY, California
CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELO, Puerto Rico
NATHAN DEAL, Georgia
MAURICE D. HINCHEY, New York
ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, Guam
SAM FARR, California

DANIEL VAL KISH, *Chief of Staff*
CHRISTINE KENNEDY, *Chief Clerk/Administrator*
JOHN LAWRENCE, *Minority Staff Director*
DAVID DYE, *Chief Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS AND LANDS

JAMES V. HANSEN, Utah, *Chairman*

JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR., Tennessee
JOEL HEFLEY, Colorado
JOHN T. DOOLITTLE, California
WAYNE ALLARD, Colorado
RICHARD W. POMBO, California
PETER G. TORKILDSEN, Massachusetts
J.D. HAYWORTH, Arizona
BARBARA CUBIN, Wyoming
WES COOLEY, Oregon
HELEN CHENOWETH, Idaho
LINDA SMITH, Washington
GEORGE P. RADANOVICH, California
JOHN B. SHADEGG, Arizona
BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico
NICK J. RAHALL II, West Virginia
BRUCE F. VENTO, Minnesota
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
GERRY E. STUDDS, Massachusetts
CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELO, Puerto Rico
NATHAN DEAL, Georgia
MAURICE D. HINCHEY, New York
ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, Guam

ALLEN FREEMYER, *Staff Director/Counsel*
STEVE HODAPP, *Professional Staff*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held February 23, 1995	1
Text of H.R. 260	107
Statements of Members:	
Cremeans, Hon. Frank A., a U.S. Representative from Ohio	3
Cooley, Hon. Wes, a U.S. Representative from Oregon	20
Hansen, Hon. James V., a U.S. Representative from Utah and Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Lands	1
Hefley, Hon. Joel, a U.S. Representative from Colorado	4
Prepared statement	6
Richardson, Hon. Bill, a U.S. Representative from New Mexico	2
Underwood, Hon. Robert A., a U.S. Representative from Guam	24
Vento, Hon. Bruce F., a U.S. Representative from Minnesota	8
Statements of witnesses:	
Gale, Rich, Board Member, Association of National Park Rangers	15
Prepared statement	77
Kennedy, Roger, Director, National Park Service	53
Prepared statement	98
McPherson, Harry, Attorney, Verner, Liipfert, Bernhard, McPherson & Hand	44
Prepared statement	96
Murphy, Don, Director, California State Parks	42
Prepared statement	88
Pritchard, Paul, President, National Parks and Conservation Association	12
Prepared statement	71
Ridenour, James M., Director, Eppley Institute, University of Indiana	10
Prepared statement	63
Winks, Robin, Professor, Yale University	39
Prepared statement	84
Additional material supplied:	
Seiberling, John F., former Representative from Ohio	60
Pritchard, Paul (National Parks and Conservation Association): New Parks: New Promise (report containing figures requested by Mr. Richardson at hearing)	122
Ridenour, James M. (National Park Service): The Director's Report—Thinning the Blood	70

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM REFORM ACT

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1995

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS AND LANDS, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES,

Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in room 1324, Longworth House Office Building, Hon. James V. Hansen [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES V. HANSEN, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM UTAH AND CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS AND LANDS

Mr. HANSEN. We will call this meeting to order. This is a meeting of the National Parks, Forests and Land Subcommittee. The legislation before the subcommittee today is an important first step in addressing the two most pressing problems confronting the National Park Service today, the integrity of the Park System and funding.

In the 15 years that I have served on this subcommittee, Congress has added nearly 40 areas to the National Park System. Without benefit of prioritization and without regard to impacts on the current Park System, I have watched Congress establish parks ranging from multimillion-acre natural areas to sites consisting of a single building on a piecemeal, ad hoc basis.

While some of the most outlandish proposals, such as those to establish the Tenement National Historic Park and the proposal to turn Wrigley Field baseball stadium into units of the Park System have not been enacted, many other questionable areas driven by the "burning in the bosom" of one or more Members of Congress have made it through the congressional gauntlet.

My concern is simply this: the strength of our National Park System lies in its integrity. Each time we establish an area which lowers the threshold of what it takes to become a park area, we lower the overall park standards and quality. Without benefit of a vision for the agency, as provided for in Mr. Hefley's bill, the integrity of the National Park System remains under constant assault.

I recognize that much has changed since the Park Service Organic Act in 1916. Without benefit of explicit congressional redefinition, the role of the National Park Service has evolved to reflect the diversity and interests of the American people. Despite the lack of overall congressional direction and of a defensible process for identifying new park areas, most of the changes to the Park System have been very positive.

However, as we enter the next century, we must answer such questions as: Do we need more than 50 Civil War battlefields in the Park System? Is 4.5 million acres of Mojave Desert enough? Is it the role of the Federal Government to preserve urban open space or to keep open public beaches in New York City? Should we spend Federal dollars to preserve huge industrial plants such as steel mills?

These questions and more are currently before Congress, and we must develop consensus answers to these questions before we act. If the answers to these questions mean that Congress should deauthorize some units of the Park System, so be it. I am interested in making our Park System the very best in the world. I am not interested in the number of parks on the books.

I want to thank each of our distinguished witnesses today for their testimony. I know that they have given much thought to these important issues, and I look forward to a continuing dialog with them as we develop this legislation.

I want members of the committee to note we have got a vote on right now. I assume it is a vote on the journal. Why don't we hear from the ranking member, Mr. Richardson. Then let us go vote, and we will come back, and I will ask unanimous consent that we hear from Mr. Hefley, the chief sponsor of the bill, and Mr. Vento who sponsored the bill. Mr. Richardson.

STATEMENT OF HON. BILL RICHARDSON, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW MEXICO

Mr. RICHARDSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me begin by complimenting Mr. Vento and Mr. Hefley for the bipartisan and thoughtful manner in which they have approached this issue. H.R. 260 is an important bill, and I appreciate your holding this hearing. I doubt there is anyone in this room who doesn't like our national parks. I take pride in the National Park System units in my own State of New Mexico, as I suspect the Chairman does for those in Utah.

The National Park System, however, transcends State borders and any justifiable pride we may have for an individual or group of parks. Congress did get it right I believe in 1970 when they declared in law, and I quote, "...these areas, though distinct in character, are united through their interrelated purposes and resources into one National Park System as cumulative expressions of a single national heritage; that, individually and collectively, these areas derive increased national dignity and recognition of their superb environmental quality through their inclusion jointly with each other in one National Park System preserved and managed for the benefit and inspiration of all the people of the United States."

H.R. 260 is a bipartisan measure because it is aimed at enhancing the quality of our National Park System. However, there seems to be more and more talk of this bill as a park closure bill, with some viewing it as a means to close parks they believe are nonessential.

Contrary to what some might believe, it is not easy to get an area designated as a unit of the National Park System, and it should not be easy to remove them from the system as well. Those

who think deauthorization is a panacea for whatever ails the National Park System, in my judgment, are not correct.

We could deauthorize all of the 30-plus units designated since 1980. Yet, we would save less than 2 percent of the National Park Service's annual operation and maintenance budget. Likewise, those who think that this bill is a means to stop additions to the system are wrong, in my judgment, as well. Important land forms and themes of American history are underrepresented or not represented at all in the current system.

Mr. Chairman, don't get me wrong. H.R. 260 on the whole is a good bill that reflects a compromise of differing viewpoints on how to achieve a common goal. Many of us supported the bill last Congress. I hope to support it this year as well. However, I think we should tread very carefully on this matter. There are no quick fixes or easy outs to whatever problems the Park System or the Park Service may have. Only a balanced and fair reform process will achieve our goal of enhancing the National Park System. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Frank A. Cremeans follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. FRANK A. CREMEANS, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM OHIO

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have been a member of the 104th Congress for almost two months. During this time, I have participated in a number of measures to reform Congress and the Federal Government. Today's hearing is only another example of how big government has taken it upon itself to look out for people by purchasing land for "their benefit" without asking its citizens if this was necessary. The United States has over a $4.8 trillion debt and seems to continually want to add new land to its already swelling 650-million acre inventory. Mr. Chairman, as I am sure that this hearing will demonstrate, the Federal Govenment needs to get out of the "real estate" business and get back to the important busines at hand.

I would like to share with the Resources Committee an example that is currently taking place within the 6th Congressional District of Ohio. The Wayne National Forest, which currerntly owns 212,000 acres of land in 12 counties in southeast Ohio (30,000 acres are located in Washington County), has laid siege to the Frontier School District. They want to purchase an additional 789 acres of land and add it to the 38% of the district that they already possess. If a constituent of mine would purchase this land, they would have to pay a yearly tax of $3.34 per acre to the school district. If the Wayne National Forest is successful in purchasing this land, they will only have to pay $.29 an acre, a price that is subsidized through the "PILT" fund. The difference is an additional loss of $1900 worth of tax revenue to the school district. Just imagine what this tax money could purchase for the students of the Frontier School District—new text books, new athletic equipment, or maybe just basic school supplies.

It does not make much sense to me to allow this transaction to continue. In a time of belt tightening and penny pinching, how can I look in the mirror and let this type of travesty continue without taking a stand and put up a fight. Therefore, on February 28th, I introduced two pieces of legislation that would put a stop to this infringement upon the citizens of the Frontier School District. The first bill will place a moratorium on any additional land acquisitions until the year 2002. Maybe by then, with the U.S. Government's fiscal house in order, we would allow them to possibly "look" at additional land. The other piece will force the Federal Government to pay the same amount in taxes on land it acquires as that of an individual. Why should the Feds be any different! If they want to purchase land for whatever use, then let them pay a fair market value for it. It is my hope that these pieces of legislation will make the Federal Government think twice in the future with regards to land acquisition.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for allowing this hearing to take place. I am sure that there are others who have had similar experiences as those of the people of Washington County, Ohio.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you, Mr. Richardson. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hefley and Mr. Vento will have the benefit of giving

their opening remarks immediately when we return. Is there any objection? Without objection, so ordered. We are adjourned until we come back on this vote. I would appreciate it if everyone would vote and hurry back.

[Whereupon, the subcommittee, at 10:05 a.m., was adjourned to vote.]

Mr. HANSEN. I reconvene the meeting. The gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Kildee.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I would like to be recorded as being present here. I have to go over to a markup in the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you. We appreciate your attendance. Prior to going over to vote, we had unanimous consent that would allow the sponsor of this particular piece of legislation to give an opening statement and also Mr. Vento who is also an original sponsor of this legislation. Our rules are such that only the Chairman and the ranking member can give opening statements so that is why we did this under unanimous consent. We will recognize the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Hefley.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOEL HEFLEY, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM COLORADO

Mr. HEFLEY. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for that unanimous consent request and for holding a hearing on this bill, and I would be remiss if I didn't thank Mr. Vento, the Chairman of our committee last year on the Parks Committee.

I think this bill is a result of a truly bipartisan effort; a conservative Republican from Colorado sits down with a more liberal Democrat from Minnesota and with the contention that these kinds of things shouldn't be partisan issues. Most of the things we deal with in this committee shouldn't be real partisan.

We sat down and last year hacked out with the help of the Parks Department and a number of other people—we hacked out this bill, and it passed the House unanimously. The people that were there that day all voted for it. It got hung up in the Senate in the last days. But it is something that I believe we have the opportunity today to do some really good for the National Park System and for the country. In any event, I am sure today's testimony will be extremely interesting.

Over the past few months, this bill has gotten a lot of press. Most of it has been surprisingly supportive. Not everyone is convinced this is the way to approach the Park Service problem, but most seem to agree there is a Park Service problem and that we should do something about it.

Unfortunately, a lot of people have chosen—a lot of the press, as a matter of fact, has chosen to focus on those portions of H.R. 260 that might entail park closing. That is not what the bill is all about. Therefore, I would like to give a little show and tell which will help us to understand what this bill is all about.

First of all, let me give you a picture of what I regard as one of the jewels of the system. I will share this here—one of the jewels of the system. This picture is Yellowstone National Park. Now, who could say that Yellowstone isn't a crown jewel in the Park System?

When Director Kennedy talks about rangers living in third-world conditions, I assume, Director Kennedy, that this is what you are talking about. This is not right. This shouldn't happen, and yet it is happening.

Let me give you a closeup of Crater Lake. Now, Crater Lake, again, is one of the really beautiful, beautiful parks in our system. And to show you here, this is a pole holding up the roof at the lodge at Crater Lake. I mean, this is a timber that we have added on the outside of the building to hold up that roof; again, something that just should not happen in our Park System.

Here is the interior of the bathhouse at Hot Springs National Park. And I don't know if you can see this or not from back there, but if you can, it is in absolute deplorable condition. Hot Springs National Park—what that is all about is bathhouses, and this is the interior of that which is deteriorating terribly because of damp conditions.

Edison National Historical Site in New Jersey has needed rehab work for years, and this just illustrates a little of the condition. I see Director Kennedy out there shaking his head, yes, he knows what we are talking about.

And one more—Larry, is that it? OK. This bill is an attempt to deal with these kinds of problems. You can differ on the amount, but it is generally agreed that the backlog of between $10 billion to $15 billion exists for land acquisition, construction, and operation and maintenance in our Park System. Yet, the Park Service has regularly been directed to develop sites and projects which drew the scrutiny of this committee only after they had already begun. This bill is an attempt to deal with that problem.

H.R. 260 asks the Park Service to develop a plan to carry the Park System into the next century. That plan should include goals and objectives, an inventory of parks, the criteria for selection of sites for national park designation, and a numerical list of priorities for both urban and nonurban parks.

The Park Service will then take this template up against the Park System and see what is there, what is not there, and, in some cases, what doesn't belong. In these latter cases, alternative forms of management will be examined. In these presumably rare cases, soft-landing provisions would be provided for the affected communities.

If the Park Service fails to outline how it will carry out this mandate in 1 year, a blue ribbon panel will be given 2 years to do the job. The bill also underlines the procedures for designating new parks, to make sure new units reflect national significance and not political clout.

In conclusion, I would like to say that the history of this bill has been marked by an unusual degree of member-to-member contact and cooperation. We could probably go over each line of this bill and pinpoint which points I wanted, which Mr. Vento fought for, and which the Park Service put in.

When I was lobbying for this bill last year, I said we should be able to discuss these kinds of issues in an atmosphere of good fellowship without undue politicizing. I think we achieved that on H.R. 260. Therefore, I would say that those who have questions about H.R. 260 need to work with us, help make this bill better,

help us make this work. You know I hold a lot of town meetings in my district in Colorado, and there aren't too many things that government does that make my constituents stand up and cheer, but they do like their parks.

Many of you have heard me say this before, but I will repeat it in closing here. I grew up in Oklahoma before the days when air conditioning was quite so prevalent, and every Oklahoman wanted to get out of Oklahoma in the summertime for a little bit and get into the cool. I didn't grow up in a family that had a lot of money, but we could load the station wagon with a tent and a grub box, and we could go to national parks. And we visited national parks mostly in New Mexico and Colorado but all over the country really.

As a child, I developed a deep affection for our National Park System and a feeling that this is something that government really does better than private industry, and there are not many things I would say that about. That is the reason I wanted to be on Mr. Vento's committee last year and on Mr. Hansen's committee this year. I want to make the Park System better.

I watched the struggle that the Park System has had with some of the things that we make you do that you would rather not do, and we are trying to find a solution to that—a rationale for how to strengthen and make better our National Park System. And we appreciate the cooperation we have had from the Park System and from everybody on this. We hope we can come up with a piece of legislation here that everybody will be very, very proud we had a part in.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to take so long, but I wanted to set the stage for this, and I do appreciate this hearing today.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Hefley follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. JOEL HEFLEY, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM COLORADO

Mr. Chairman, thank you for scheduling today's hearing. I think we have an opportunity today to do some good for the National Park System and the country. In any event, I'm sure today's testimony will be extremely interesting.

The bill you see before you today represents the joint efforts of Republicans, Democrats and the National Park Service. If we were forced to, I'm sure we could point out which sections of this bill can be traced to myself or to Mr. Vento or to the Park Service. It is a truly bipartisan bill that deserves your support. I believe last year's roll call vote of 412–0 in the House proves my point.

What would this bill do? Simply stated, H.R. 260 would amend the 1970 General Authorities Act and require the Park Service to prioritize and compile a list of areas that should be included for possible inclusion in the Park System, keeping in mind factors such as the area's natural and historic significance and the rarity of its resources. The Park Service would be directed to consult with various agencies, State officials, advisers, scholars and others about which aspects of the American experience are inadequately represented. This final list will help guide Congress in its future decisions.

H.R. 260 requires the Interior Secretary to submit to Congress, for the first time, a coherent vision statement for the Park System within 3 fiscal years. This vision statement would include a list of parks that might be removed from the system. In those cases where alternative forms of management are recommended, State, local and private options for management would be considered and "soft-landing" provisions included for those areas where operations are terminated. Any alternative form of management would have to be approved by Congress. Both of these later provisions were included at the insistence of my colleague and cosponsor, Mr. Vento. In his words, Congress authorized these parks, Congress must deauthorize them.

If the Park Service does not submit this list to Congress within a year of completion of the overall plan, a 7-member commission would be appointed with 2 years to carry out the charge previously given the Park Service.

The bill also establishes a numerical priority system for cultural and natural parks, in order that long-standing Park Service priorities do not get lost over the years, and directs the Park Service to submit a list of recommended new areas to the Congress with its annual budget submission.

That is what H.R. 260 is intended to do. Now let me tell you what it will not do. It will not sell off the Grand Canyon. It will not turn Park Service operations over to Disney. Finally, H.R. 260 will not, in and of itself, result in the closure of a single park. Instead, it will set in motion a process by which we can review and strengthen the Park System. Will parks be closed as part of that process? Perhaps. But this bill will not close them nor does it, in any way, direct the Park Service to close parks. That is for the Park Service or, if necessary, for an independent commission and finally, Congress, to decide. It is because Congress has fallen down on this responsibility that we introduced this bill in the first place.

Now, given the emotional attachment Americans have to our national parks, the general reaction to H.R. 260 has been encouraging. Rather than outright dismissal, most thoughtful observers have concluded that this is a review that needs to be done and have suggested ways in which the process outlined in H.R. 260 might be strengthened. We expect to hear some of those suggestions today. Clearly, people who know and love parks care deeply about them and realize something must be done to improve the present situation.

Given this background of cooperation, it is unfortunate some have attempted to paint this legislation as a mere park-closing bill, as the carrier of a hidden agenda, aimed at opening the crown jewels of our public lands to development. To those people I would recommend the advice of the former chairman, "When all else fails, read the bill." There is no hidden agenda here. This bill is a sincere attempt to set priorities, to choose quality over quantity, to make the tough choices between creating new areas which can never be adequately funded or taking care of our crown jewels. It is an attempt to force choices between parks and housing for rangers. It is an attempt to enforce reason on a process that is bleeding our park system dry.

We have heard Secretary Babbitt state recently that no parks will be closed under his charge. I would ask the Secretary to read the bill and show me where it specifies parks for closure. I would ask him where he intends to get the money to pay for $1 billion to $2 billion backlogs in land acquisition, for the $6 billion shortfall in construction, for the $400 million to $800 million backlog in operations and maintenance. And these are figures which do not include the disclosures aired 2 weeks ago. How does he plan to pay for ranger housing at Yosemite National Park or for completion of that park's general management plan? Where does he plan to get the money to proceed with war in the Pacific sites, largely unfunded years after their authorization? What will he do when billions of dollars in repairs are needed at Glacier National Park, projected repairs that are not even included in the backlog I cited? The Secretary's desire for new parks may well be sincere. After all, this is the man that 2 years ago said the creation of national parks was one of the finest expressions of the public will. But, given the present budget climate, that desire is a prescription for the continued deterioration of the Park System's infrastructure and for lower morale among Park Service employees. Simply put, Mr. Babbitt is being unrealistic.

As I have described in this statement, this bill has been marked by an unusual degree of bipartisanship and cooperation. We have tried very hard to keep politics out of the end product. This is not and should not be about politics. Instead, it is a matter of quality over quantity, of realism versus wishful thinking. I would hope the Administration will join us in producing a bill we can all be proud of, instead of being obstructionist.

Back in my Colorado district, I hold regular town meetings and, I can tell you, there aren't too many things the Government does that makes people stand up and cheer. But parks are one of the things Americans believe their Government does right. Yet that system grows worse for lack of sufficient funds every day. By enacting this legislation, taxpayers can be assured their tax dollars are well-spent. More important, we will pass on a more worthy national park legacy to future generations.

Thank you for the time, Mr. Chairman, and I look forward to hearing today's testimony.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you, Mr. Hefley. We will now turn to the gentleman from Minnesota, the former Chairman of the committee, Mr. Vento.

STATEMENT OF BRUCE F. VENTO, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM MINNESOTA

Mr. VENTO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I thank the members for the opportunity to address some opening remarks to the issue in the measure before us. I appreciate the good faith in which Mr. Hefley and yourself have worked this last year and the continuity in terms of representing and presenting the measure before the committee and the Congress in this session as responsibilities have changed.

The problem, though, remains similar. The issue is one between the execution and the actual laws and what happens in terms of appropriations. Trying to set up a better process certainly, I think, and building a sound foundation in terms of the consideration and designation of national parks is very important to finally achieving and obtaining the objective of protection and the designation of parks. As my colleague from Colorado has stated, the parks are very much supported by the American public. One of the British comments picked up by one of the witnesses today is that the parks are one of the best ideas America ever had.

And as a liberal from Minnesota, but I would claim a conservationist and a conservative in the true sense of the word, on this committee, and I think my actions testify to that, I very much want this system to persist and to work. Many of the parks have been really provided through philanthropy from the public domain, from various other branches of the Federal Government, the military.

And, of course, the reason we are here is because I think questions have arisen as to the integrity of the system, to the designation and to some extent the available resources to meet the challenges that are inherent in the 368 units of the Park System—some new units, but by and large, even the photographs that my colleague from Colorado held up represent the long-time parks. Hot Springs was brought into the Park System at its inception of the park law in 1916—the Organic Act.

So this backlog is building in terms of maintenance, in terms of inholdings in the park, and they again go back to 1916. Some of those inholdings have been there as long as the parks have been designated under the Organic Act, and certainly some of the new units. We need to, of course, provide a better format, a better blueprint in terms of directions from the Department, from the Park Service, from the professionals in the field, and to the Congress.

Congress, of course, is complicit in the designation because that is the only way that something becomes a park is if it passes Congress as an Act and is signed by the President. By and large, there are some monuments that can be designated without our involvement. I think that that is not a serious problem or at least it hasn't been to date.

But the point is, it is very important that we establish a process, and we often have the recommendations made to us whether it was Steamtown, whether it was the Pinckney Historic Site, recommendations made by the Park Service as to positive or affirmative action, or Keeweet in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, one that doesn't get mentioned too often but I think has some of the same character and problems as other new units that have been added to the Park System.

We tried, I think, to craft those measures at the time in good faith and to limit and to guide the development, designation, and administration of those units in a way that was responsible given the political realities and the other pressures that we were under. Often, of course, many of the problems that we see here really are that the laws that we write with good intentions are not followed through in the years that follow the designation. That was evident last night.

I will just call my colleagues' attention—I don't know the details—but last night, the Appropriations Committee recommended that $327 million be taken out of the Park Service budget for 1995. I don't know what that means, but I suspect what it means is that the backlog isn't going to make very much progress on the basis of that type of reduction.

Now, I suggest that we look at the details of that. It probably is something that, again, strings out the responsibility in a way that adds additional costs. It may be that it was on a land-water conservation. I don't know where they took the money. Part of it was out of urban parks and some of the programs that are central there.

I think the Park Service and the mandate—the challenge has been and is—remains one that I am committed to. I think this Act, getting recommendations from the Park Service rather than a range of options, having a specific procedure set up to reexamine existing units, is and can be a very positive means in terms of establishing policy and building and retaining the integrity and credibility of the Park Service.

So I look forward to the hearings and working with members. Indeed, we have each spent a lot of time looking at this. I have worked very hard to try and ensure that the Park Service and the system would be able to meet its responsibilities and will continue to do so, continue to try to control the Appropriations Committees to give the priorities to the elements passed in law as well as to their own personal goals in those spending measures which, after all, carry forth as to what the policy is going to be, not just good intentions.

Mr. Chairman, thank you, and I thank the members for their patience.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you, Mr. Vento. We appreciate your comments. Our first panel—and as I call your name, would you come up and take your place—Mr. James Ridenour, former Director of the National Park Service, now Director of Eppley Institute at the University of Indiana; Mr. Paul Pritchard, President of the National Parks and Conservation Association; and Mr. Rick Gale, board member of the Association of National Park Rangers.

Now, gentlemen, you notice there in front of you there are three lights. The green light is going to go on, and you can go ahead and talk. If the yellow light goes on, start wrapping up, and when the red light goes on, would you please terminate your comments. And I know that we are going to take your full testimony and make it part of the record. If you could compile your statements into 5 minutes, we would really appreciate that. That would be very helpful to us, and we would be very appreciative if you would do that. So, Mr. Ridenour.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, I would just ask unanimous consent to place in the record a statement from former Congressman and Chairman of the Subcommittee, John Seiberling.

Mr. HANSEN. Without objection.

Mr. VENTO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Seiberling can be found at the end of the hearing.]

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Ridenour, we welcome you here. We appreciate the great work you did when you were the Director, and it is a privilege and pleasure for us to have you with us today. So we will now turn to you, sir.

STATEMENT OF JAMES RIDENOUR, DIRECTOR, EPPLEY INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF INDIANA

Mr. RIDENOUR. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, it is with pleasure and 2 years of retrospect that I return to the halls of Congress to testify in favor of H.R. 260. Along the face of it, this bill is about parks. In the context of today's debates in Washington, H.R. 260 takes on a deeper meaning. It flirts with the discussions of balanced budgets, line item vetoes, and unfunded mandates.

While no one should operate under the delusion or the illusion that this bill solves all the problems of the parks, it does sound a call for a return to sanity in the way parks have been and will be designated. This bill will not provide the $4 billion needed to eliminate the backlog of deteriorating park infrastructure, but it will stop the bleeding, it will stabilize the patient, and, most critically, create a partnership between the Legislative and Executive Branch to deal with the future of the system—a partnership that has long been missing.

I have recently written a book called, "The National Parks Compromised: Pork Barrel Politics and America's Treasures." I point out that in a 10-year period from 1983 to 1993, the National Park Service received nearly $1.4 billion more than it had asked for. That would seem to be an agency director's dream, but it was not. In most cases, Congress did not direct those dollars to critical areas of importance in the parks. Instead, they were directed to new construction, land acquisition not high on the priority list of the National Park Service, if they appeared on the list at all.

On a visit to Sequoia/Kings Canyon, I saw raw sewage running down the gutters in the parking lots. I visited Yosemite and found a badly overcrowded valley in need of infrastructure improvements that would allow the movement of employees to less crowded areas. I visited Yellowstone and found deteriorating roads and unacceptable employee housing. I visited Independence Hall and found electrical threats to the building. I must hold the record for visiting sewage treatment plants in the national parks.

I pleaded my case for funds to repair badly deteriorating infrastructure and the daily operational needs of the parks, but, instead, Congress funded additions of marginal parks and more new construction. That is when I coined the term, "Thinning of the blood of the National Park Service," and that is exactly what has been happening and continues to happen.

Additional responsibilities have been added with little thought as to how to care for the responsibilities we now have. We are stretch-

ing the abilities of National Park Service employees and volunteers to care for this vast system, and we are watering down the quality of the properties within the system. We are "thinning the blood" of our national parks.

I visited the Canadian Director of Parks because he visited me a few years ago and told me of a plan they had in which they were going to get to a point and say, "That is it. That is all the parks. We have done it." And I called them a week ago to see if they were still on that path, and they are. They have identified 39 regions of their country and are pushing to have a representative park in each of the 39, and their goal is to have this done by the year 2000. Then their park system would be complete. That is kind of a unique concept.

I don't think we want to go that far. But, in my mind, there are few great "natural" parks left to create in this country that aren't already under some form of government ownership. An obvious exception to this statement would be the designation of a tall grass prairie park much of which may lay on private land.

But as we continue to evolve historically, we will continually face the need to designate historical and cultural parks. For example, we didn't need a space park devoted to telling the story of our involvement in space until we had a space program. There will be other examples.

We should continue to designate new parks, but we should do this very cautiously, and we should carefully consider the best ways to manage areas. In some cases, it may be State or local government. In other cases, it might be a nonprofit or even a for-profit organization that would manage an area. The Federal Government should not be all things to all people.

One of the ways we proposed granting assistance and recognition to communities and areas desiring park status was a concept we called the American Heritage Area. I believe you passed legislation embodying this concept last year, but it didn't make it through the Senate. It is an idea worth further exploration.

Our goal was to provide some form of recognition to the local communities without going so far as to grant a long-term Federal relationship. Communities are often looking for help, but they are not sure what they want.

We envisioned filling this need by providing some upfront technical assistance, Federal recognition in some form, but not getting into the capital expenditures and the operating cost of that local system. You have to be careful when you do that.

You don't want to get into a situation where you are giving them the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval so that people go to them thinking they are going to a national park and end up flooding your switchboards here in Washington saying they found rest rooms that weren't clean. So that is a danger in that area.

Most people that want a park or a property are looking either for money, recognition, or some sort of preservation. In other words, if we had the money in the right place, the National Park Service would probably not be managing beaches in New York City or in San Francisco. They wouldn't be purchasing the very expensive tracts of land in southern California.

Why should they? These are not beaches or mountains of national significance. People don't hop on a plane in Europe to enjoy the great natural beaches of New York City or San Francisco. Yet, these beaches and mountains are important and are locally, maybe even regionally significant. Where should the money come from to support them, and why has Congress become involved? And I think I know. The answer is money.

In the case of Steamtown, it is a good project. Its roots are in history, and its future is in tourism. It is a great place to visit especially if you are a steam engine buff, but is it a legitimate national park? I doubt it. Is it a good economic development project with tourism potential? Probably so. Would I plan a family trip from California to visit Steamtown? I might if I were a steam engine buff.

In retrospect, Steamtown might better have been channeled through an economic development agency such as the Department of Commerce. Then we wouldn't have this confusion that exists. It would have had to stand the test of receiving funding as an economic development project rather than a national park site.

I have a number of amendments that I would offer. They are largely technical in nature, and I see the red light is on, Mr. Chairman. Maybe I will hold my fire for questions.

I just want it noted in conclusion that we did the J. Alden Weir site when I was Director—the painter's home in Connecticut. I asked if J. Alden Weir was really a significant painter. I got various opinions from that he was in the top 10 to he was in the bottom 20.

Until it came time for the congressional hearings, and, obviously, the Connecticut congressional delegation had gotten to everyone, and they thought he was the greatest painter since Rembrandt. But I see you have got Thomas Cole on your list to consider this time around. Is Cole better than Weir? I don't know.

But the one thing in my technical amendments I say is you may want to go beyond just talking about sites and talk about theme studies. Are you going to take any artist's home, and if you are going to take an artist's home, which one should you take among all the artists of the United States. Are you going to take any architect's home or whatever it might be? So I suggest you add a little bit about theme studies maybe before doing site studies in some of these instances.

I appreciate the time to talk with you, Mr. Chairman, and get away from the IU basketball scene at Indiana which has not been particularly good this year.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Ridenour can be found at the end of the hearing.]

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you, Mr. Ridenour. I appreciate your testimony. Mr. Pritchard, we will turn the time to you.

STATEMENT OF PAUL PRITCHARD, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL PARKS AND CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

Mr. PRITCHARD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is a pleasure to be here. I am the President of the National Parks and Conservation Association. I appreciate your willingness to take the testimony

and the 19 pages of specific suggestions and recommendations we have which we will leave with the subcommittee, Mr. Chairman.

May I say though that as we go forward with this very important legislation that it be looked at as probably the most important action that will be taken regarding national parks since the Organic Act of 1916. There is no issue of greater consequence than what you all are dealing with, and I commend to you the importance of this process.

I have had the privilege of speaking with Mr. Vento and Mr. Hefley and I want to say how much I appreciate the nonpartisan approach that both have taken with respect to H.R. 260. I also appreciate the opportunity to appear today and discuss this issue with the subcommittee.

Speaker Gingrich has talked about the unique American character and culture which must be preserved. There is no better repository of America's culture than our National Park System, and that is why we hope that the committee will follow Chairman Young's promise and take this process and subsequent hearings to the people.

We support field hearings because we sincerely believe that they will contribute to the development of a fair process and an impartial piece of legislation which will carry out the intent of the sponsors of this bill.

May I say also that we supported this bill last year and would hope to support this bill in the future. That is why we have come forward with the recommendations that I will summarize.

It is also a privilege for me to be here with Mr. Ridenour and Dr. Robin Winks. Both of these individuals recently participated in an NPCA-sponsored day-long meeting with other prominent park authorities on H.R. 260. I am grateful for their time because our recommendations are, in part, influenced by the thoughts of the meeting's attendees. We have also conducted focus groups around the country, and we will share those comments.

First of all, let me specifically relate to the need for a national park system plan. We very much support that concept. We feel though that the concept should be ratified by the Congress before the review of the existing units (Sections 102 and 103) are carried out. We can give you more specific thoughts on that, but our sense is that Congress is the appropriate body to establish and authorize parks. We believe you should also approve the criteria that will be used to determine whether existing units merit continued inclusion in the National Park System.

An important recommendation relates to the NEPA exemption. We highly recommend that this bill be amended to allow for NEPA to do the work that it has done so effectively for over 25 years. The NEPA exemption is an important point and one which we believe could cause a great deal of acrimony and misunderstanding. NEPA provides for public review and comment and this bill should comply with NEPA.

We also would suggest to you that there is a need for you to study another issue that H.R. 260 doesn't address, and that is the very management of the National Park System. We believe that a lot of the problems that are being addressed here, and that have been addressed in the past by this committee, have been brought

about by having the National Park Service in the Department of Interior.

We would encourage you to use this opportunity to study the organizational structure of the National Park Service to consider if it merits a Board management structure similar to those of the Smithsonian Institution, the Library of Congress, and the Federal Reserve.

Regarding criteria for the review of existing units, we think there should be two tiers. The first tier should deal just with those most important questions as were just addressed by Mr. Ridenour, and that is issues of national significance, feasibility, and suitability. Does this particular park, existing or future, merit inclusion in the National Park System based on these standards? If it does not pass those questions, then it needs to deal with other more secondary considerations. We have included some recommendations in the attachment to NPCA's testimony.

Of the criteria in the bill, the issue of cost is one that could be interpreted as a Trojan horse. It is mentioned several times, and we think that cost is an important factor and we certainly support a recommendation which would include that. But we are concerned as to how you would determine costs; for example, the cost per acre, the cost per visitor. How do you value where Lincoln gave the Gettysburg Address versus where Lincoln was assassinated? The cost of these factors is also very difficult to determine. We would encourage you that, at best, cost is a secondary criteria or part of a feasibility and suitability review.

We also recommend to you that you create a Citizens Advisory Council consisting of national park experts who would parallel the work of the Park Service. They should also have the authority to report back to Congress and the American people without the political review and comments of the Office of Management and Budget.

We would also recommend an exemption from the Federal Advisory Committee Act, which is often a cumbersome and bureaucratic obstacle to an expeditious process.

Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Ridenour's comments on the new areas provisions cover that subject amply. We agree with his comment and further recommend that this process will not be an effort to inhibit the additions of appropriate new areas.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, we recommend that you consider an authorization for these processes. The bill does not include funds for the National Park Service to do the work that H.R. 260 would require. The National Park Service deserves these authorizations to do this work and they deserve an appropriation as well.

We encourage you not to ask the National Park Service to make this another unfunded congressional mandate.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my testimony. Thank you again for allowing us this privilege.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Pritchard can be found at the end of the hearing.]

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you, Mr. Pritchard. We appreciate your comments. Mr. Gale.

STATEMENT OF RICK GALE, BOARD MEMBER, ASSOCIATION OF NATIONAL PARK RANGERS

Mr. GALE. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Association of National Park Rangers on H.R. 260. Our association has long been interested in having clear criteria established and applied for determining the national significance of new areas to be admitted to this Park System. H.R. 260 appears to be an effort to do this, and we commend your committee for their interest in this.

Clear criteria for authorizing nationally significant additions to the Park System, coupled with appropriations sufficient to protect and manage a new area, we believe, are the keys to maintaining the integrity of the system. The danger of not applying such criteria and practices is the proliferation of new areas of less than national significance and the impact of such new areas on the integrity of the system as well as on the operating budgets and staffing of existing areas of the system.

The approach in recent years has become increasingly political with standards for national significance which were envisioned by the Congress in 1916 being subverted by the need, it appears to us, to have some type of area with the term "national" in its title in every congressional district.

This is not a new phenomena, however. William Everhart, in his book, "The National Park Service," recalls, and I quote, "In 1916 alone, there were bills introduced for 16 new national parks, which would have doubled the number existing. Fortunately, and perhaps proving the system, Congress passed only two, Hawaii Volcanoes...and Lassen Volcanic...; the rest of the proposed parks were fairly dreadful.

"In one 3-week period of the 1920's, bills were introduced in the Congress to establish High Knob National Park in Virginia, Nicolet National Park in Wisconsin, the Yakima National Park in Washington, Killdeer National Park in North Dakota, Wonderland National Park in South Dakota, and eight more pieces of less-than-spectacular wonders scattered around the country. Claims were often made for historic sites, ranging from the purely insignificant to the hilarious, most of which are clearly worthy of oblivion."

Everhart also mentions that in 1922, the then Secretary of the Interior, Albert Fall, was quoted as saying, "Whenever in the public lands I can find a pleasant place for local people to go up and camp, there I shall have a national park."

Sadly, Mr. Fall's urge to add "every pleasant place to camp" to the system has been replaced by the equally disturbing trend of the past several years to attempt to add thinly disguised revitalization projects in both rural and urban areas of this country.

We are not dismissing the acute needs of this nation's urban and rural areas, where the NPS may have some role to play, but we do question attempts to use the National Park Service as an economic development agency. Each of these areas bleeds off more funding and further dilutes the significance of existing National Park System units.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that more than ever before, the National Park System is threatened with mediocrity. We think to reverse this threat two things must happen: first, we urge the Con-

gress to tighten up the process by which new areas are added to the National Park System. And, second, we urge the Congress that once authorized under those new criteria those new areas are adequately funded through the appropriations process.

Therefore, we fully support the need to establish a comprehensive study process which clearly define criteria for determining the suitability and feasibility of proposed additions to the system. As we understand it, the process outlined in Title II of this bill is similar to the processes for studying proposed additions to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers and to the National Trail System. Both of these processes have worked well for these systems, and we believe they would work in a more rational approach to adding new areas to the Park System.

We also believe that the legislative process must ensure that new areas are adequately funded for acquisition development operations before they become units of the system. We understand, Mr. Chairman, the distinction between authorization and appropriation. Yet, we believe it is vital that the link between these two processes be established when considering new area proposals. Otherwise, we will continue to see new areas authorized without additional funds with continuing dilution of the operational abilities of the existing system.

Title I also speaks to the concern of national significance by establishing a process for identifying existing areas for possible termination or modification. We believe this process, if it is to be credible to the American public, must also be based on the same national significant criteria which clearly shows why that unit should not be in the system.

Perhaps former Director of the Park Service, Newton Drury, captured the essence of this problem when he said, "If we are going to succeed in preserving the greatness of the national parks, they must be held inviolate. If we are going to whittle away at them, we should recognize at the very beginning that all such whittlings are cumulative, and the end result would be mediocracy."

Mr. Chairman, we have some specific comments on the language, and I see my time is running out. It is in our testimony. I won't go through that. But we do support this legislation, and we would be happy to answer any questions or provide any further assistance that we might to this subcommittee. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Gale can be found at the end of the hearing.]

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you, Mr. Gale. We appreciate the excellent testimony from our panel. What we will do now is we will turn to questions from the committee, and I would caution the members and the witnesses that you are included in the 5 minutes. So your question and response is part of the 5 minutes. We will start with Mr. Richardson.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Pritchard, let me ask you two questions. I think we can get the 5 minutes in. First, are there any land areas or historical themes that you see underrepresented or not represented at all in the Park System, and, if so, what are some examples?

You talked about the Citizens Commission. If we had a Park Review Commission—in other words, if we were to authorize a Park

Review Commission, where would we find impartial members? How would you suggest that we proceed with establishing such a commission? Do you allow the President, majority, minority leaders? Is that the best way to do it, or do you designate conservationists or the land use movement? How do you reach an impartial body in such a commission? And I would like you to answer both questions.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Richardson, first let me say I very much appreciate your opening statement. I thought it was very sensitive and well thought out. Regarding new areas, Mr. Gale and I were talking about areas and opinions, and I think if you ask this panel, each of us would probably have five different areas that we might think should be part of the National Park System.

That is why we think the National Park System plan should be ratified or codified by Congress. Then, the National Park Service will have clear guidance from Congress and will apply the recommendations to the review. Everyone will have an opinion, but the National Park Service should know Congress would be the best way because, unfortunately, we have identified approximately 80 areas in a written report we published in 1987. Approximately half were cultural and half were natural. I think, as Director Ridenour was implying, America's history will continue to evolve, and we need to be sensitive to any new history elements. But there are very few natural areas absent from the National Park System, except for tall grass prairie.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will you supply those 80 for the record?

Mr. PRITCHARD. Yes sir, we will.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would ask unanimous consent they be part of the hearing record.

Mr. HANSEN. Without objection.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Regarding the second question, our suggestion in the testimony is that this citizens group be constructed similar to how the National Park Service Advisory Board was appointed. That is, a body of experts who represent geology, history, and other disciplines should be part of that commission.

We would encourage you to follow that same process. Who appoints them is really a decision of the Congress. What we are most concerned about is these people be authorities in their field.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you, Mr. Richardson. Mr. Hefley.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think I will pass momentarily on my questions and give the rest of the committee a chance to ask questions, and then I would like a chance, if I might.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you, Mr. Hefley. Mr. Vento.

Mr. VENTO. Thanks, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate and want to especially welcome the panel here. They are individuals that have worked on these subjects, thought about and had the responsibility for, so it is really, I think, an excellent panel that the Chairman has provided for us in terms of giving us insights today.

One of the concerns, of course, is as we look at the parks, the Park System itself really started out in 1916 without any base of land. And we have, of course, agriculture, the Forest Service, and the BLM for public resources and many other government agencies like the Department of Defense.

In fact, I think the members would be surprised if they looked—I know I was surprised at the number of units that really came from other Federal agencies that became units of the Park System. Isn't that likely to continue? I mean, you can say you can't have parks, but then we are going to back the Forest Service and the BLM into actually providing these same types of units. Mr. Ridenour?

Mr. RIDENOUR. I might respond to that by saying that I have another term called "blurring of the lines"—thinning of the blood and blurring of the lines. And the blurring of the lines term is my feeling that you are going to see a smudging of the lines of the responsibility between the Park Service, the Forest Service, the BLM, the Fish and Wildlife. And you are going to see the possibility of activities taking part on Forest Service land that traditionally had been on Park Service land, and I see that as a very positive attitude.

Mr. VENTO. Well, I think it would also go to local and State governments that have similar researches. I note Mr. Murray, a distinguished conservationist and Park Director from the State of California, is here to address this today as well. I just wanted to point that out, that we really don't solve the problem in a sense that if the money is coming out of—I mean, we have a mission here.

I think there is some importance to having some clarity in terms of various functions, and I think that there are opportunities certainly for some of the same responsibilities depending upon the visitors. What about the visitor visitation? Doesn't the increase pushing to nearly 300 million visitor days imply that we need to make better utilization?

For instance, you have mentioned, Director Ridenour, that you visited a lot of sewer plants in the Park System. I have too. I thought some of the tour boats would get off in the Virgin Islands. And some of these locations that are designated parks represent a tremendous responsibility for the Park System. I think the park rangers end up being attendants basically at rest rooms in some cases in these instances. I mean, how do you solve it? There is this tremendous pressure of people using and overutilizing some parks and probably underutilizing others. Mr. Gale, maybe you would like to comment about that?

Mr. GALE. Well, some of that is due to accessibility, sir, and some of that just due to popularity. I mean, people are going to come to the Grand Canyon.

Mr. VENTO. So America solves that problem by, you know, taking some of the units out. Some of the most popular units that are the crown jewels are really the ones that are receiving the tremendous pressure. Isn't that correct?

Mr. GALE. That is correct, sir.

Mr. VENTO. And so there isn't any substitute. I happily record here from the Director of the Park Service that the Washington Post number is not $327 million, it is $45 million as taken out of the Park Service. But, nevertheless, it is still a significant drawback in terms of meeting commitments when you look at a budget. It is a lot of money when you have too little. I am talking about the budget statement I made in my opening comments earlier.

Mr. Pritchard, you comment about a variety of different things here, but one was the NEPA requirement. And I would just add

that that was added from last year. It is not unusual in land transactions or trades or other changes taking place to try not to get hung up on the legal as long as in substance or in essence we are completing the public participation and other elements. But I guess we can review that with the other sponsors.

Mr. Ridenour, one of the concerns is, of course, you pointed out that the Park Service had received these extra dollars. In fact, from 1977 to 1993, they received about $700 million more, sometimes more than the Park Service asked or requested. And the fact is that, of course, that was for operation and maintenance—the $700 million—only for operation and maintenance, an increase of two and a half times—you know, three times the money that they had been receiving before.

So there has been a commitment by Congress, and I might add that very often we were actually increasing it over and above what the Administration had sought. And, of course, that still has not kept up. I mean, everyone admits that there are problems—I guess, that the bigger you can make the problem, the more ridiculous it ends up looking. But I think that that is a mistake in and of itself in terms of doing that.

But much of this infrastructure, much of what has happened here is due to the existing responsibility of the increased visitorship, Mr. Chairman and members, not necessarily just the fact that we have added some units.

In fact, I would point out to my colleagues that the Park Service has done an extraordinary job of partnerships in terms of the State Historic Preservation Offices, the partnership acts, the concessions. I mean, they have looked at every resource they can, and they are certainly open and certain to look at more, to try to make these parks achieve the goals and to have the type of arrangement or governance structure that permits us to get the job done.

I am certain many of my colleagues were surprised to come here and find the Park Service only had about $1.6 billion of the budget considering the size of the budget and the responsibilities they have. They do a rather remarkable job when you consider the pervasive nature and responsibility of something like the State Historic Preservation or the National Historic Preservation Act which has offices in every one of our States.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. Doolittle from California.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Gale, I listened with interest to your testimony, and I think this is a very vital issue, and I commend the gentlemen here who have introduced this bill. It does seem strange to me though that while I have heard the National Park Service express great concern over the lack of resources and the problem with the national parks, it seems to me that they have actually officially supported during the 4 years I have been on this committee at least three-fourths of the new additions that have come before this committee.

And I would just like to ask you, Mr. Gale, what is your recollection as to their support for that, and do you not think—I mean, Congress legitimately should be blamed for doing these things, but why has the National Park Service been a willing co-conspirator?

Mr. GALE. Well, I am not sure I can answer that, sir. I am just a working minion, but I think you are right. The Service has supported all of that. I guess I would answer you by saying I think it is resolved to the fact that there is no clear national significant criteria against which those areas can be measured.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I am encouraged, based on what we are seeing that perhaps we will have a stronger voice raised, that when some congressman goes to the National Park Service to ask for you to support this, I hope you will turn him down.

I realize you are not the National Park Service per se, but we have those who will be representing officially that organization. And I just find it remarkable that there has been so much willing complicity here on the part of the Park Service. If it has become a mediocre organization, they have only themselves to blame, it seems to me, because they have indulged in these acquisitions and encouraged this to go on. Somebody could have raised his voice and helped slow that down. If the Park Service had opposed these acquisitions, I think many of them would not have occurred.

I think we are now faced with a situation—Mr. Vento is alluding to the overuse of some of the parks. I think going back even into the Reagan Administration, why, they were talking about trying to take care of the parks we have got and meet the needs of the visitors rather than constantly seeking to acquire new land. At least as one member, that is the approach that I would like to see followed. Thank you.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you, Mr. Doolittle. Mr. Cooley.

STATEMENT OF HON. WES COOLEY, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM OREGON

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to reconfirm what Mr. Doolittle has said. He said pretty much the same things I wanted to ask—is that you look at the Park Service, and you look at the expansion in the last 10 years, and you look at the cost of the taxpayers' dollars, and now we are finding out that the amount of properties which we are managing is being criticized as being "underfunded," not properly maintained, and maybe even the suggestion that we are having a national disgrace here on these historical sites.

It is really too bad that we are at this stage. In our previous discussions with the Park Service, and we brought up these issues at that time, I really truly believe that if you look at this fundamentally, this is bad management, no management, not properly setting out goals, not looking at the real object that you are supposed to do and that is provide the services to the American people in these particular pieces of land that you have decided that you are going to manage.

In any operation, as these units became less desirable, somebody in the management aspect of the Parks Department should have pulled back and said, "Look. We just can't continue on stretching ourselves thinner and thinner to the point that we are today." I think that we need to look at the management aspects of this all the way along and the appropriations of money that have been given to you in the past and how it has been utilized.

We asked for an accountability the last time we had a hearing on the Parks Department. We are still waiting for that accountability. We were told by the General Accounting Office that there had been suggestions in 1992, 1993, and 1994. We want to see those suggestions. We have not received those as of this date. I wish we had them so I could have brought those up at this time.

I know that there is a lot of pressure to do many, many things, but in the management aspect of the Parks Department, you should have been more aware of what was going on and brought this to the attention of Congress, and that wasn't done. So now what we are doing is we are trying to play catchup. We should never have played catchup. We should have been ahead of the curve, and so we are behind.

It is too bad that we do have this situation, but I hope that with this bill and other legislation that might come along that the Parks Department and Service will start to understand that there is a responsibility not only to maintain the parks and make it available to the citizens of the United States, but there is a management aspect of this whole situation.

And we need to put people in management that understand management and not just merely use the excuse that these gentlemen and ladies are rangers. This has to be managed. This is billions of dollars of American public assets, and we are not managing them. And now we are finding out that they are disintegrating; no maintenance, no management. We are losing the asset. We are losing the values of the asset.

This is public property. If we look at a $6.8 billion asset here, and we are not managing it properly, somebody is responsible. Now, maybe it is Congress, but I would say that we ought to turn back and look at the management of the Park Services all the way from the top down. And you should have been coming to us before and telling us about these problems so Congress could have done something, and then you could have turned and said, "We asked you for this, but you didn't help us." We don't see this in the past. Now we are seeing it, and I am really disappointed. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you, Mr. Cooley. Mrs. Cubin.

Mrs. CUBIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with your testimony and with the members here who feel that maintenance of the parks is probably one of the greatest priorities that we have in front of us. What I want to ask you about is how do we in Congress have an oversight of the prioritization of the money?

For example, last week in a hearing there was testimony that NPS developed a $600 million plan for the Presidio. Now, just because the Park Service Director or Manager dreams up something like that, I don't think that means that that is necessarily the way the money should be spent. So can you give me an idea of how the interchange between the Congress and the managers ought to be with regard to the prioritization of maintenance?

I think we should do away with acquisition. We need to just stop that right now and deal with the problems that we have. But in terms of dealing with maintenance, what role should the Congress have, in assisting in those decisions, or should they have a role?

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mrs. Cubin, I think that is a very important question. From the standpoint of our citizens group that has worked with the National Park Service since 1919, we find that there are several problems. Mr. Cooley just referred to one and we believe they are related.

First of all, to give the Park Service surges of money periodically like Mission 66 and the PRIP Program is not the best way to support the National Park Service's maintenance needs. The National Park Service needs to have a good plan, and Section 101 calls for such a plan. That plan needs to be approved by the Congress, not just required and developed.

But once you have approved that, then they need to have sufficient annual appropriations to do their job—not just sporadic infusions of money. NPCA supported the PRIP Program in the early 1980's because we felt that was the only way to catch up, but that is bad policy.

My last point would be that I think what both of you are pointing out is the continuing systemic problem of the National Park Service being part of a multiple-use agency and not really having a clear sense of mission and purpose.

We think you will have a better response to the testimony presented at last week's hearing if you can hold the Director clearly accountable. If the Director doesn't have to go through a lot of other parties that are reviewing the testimony, who delete and add policy statements in keeping with a particular administration, maybe you will get more straight and honest answers. So we would encourage you to include making the National Park Service an independent agency as part of the plan.

I am sorry, Mr. Ridenour. May I just add that I think there is an issue that the committee should also address, and that is other funding sources. We have addressed that in other hearings, and it deals with the fees legislation, which we support, and the concessions reform legislation. We also would be happy to talk about that at some future hearing. Thank you.

Mrs. CUBIN. Thank you.

Mr. RIDENOUR. Before we all feel too bad about ourselves, both the Congress and the Executive Branch, and I served in the last Administration, one thing that I would note that what is happening to the Park Service is not unique to the Park Service. As a kid growing up in Indiana, our roads on the farms were gravel. As a teenager, they were paved over. The county commissioners paved them over. Now, when I go back, the pavement is crumbling, and they don't have the money, and they are putting gravel on top of the base. And so we are back to gravel roads.

So this whole country is suffering with an infrastructure problem. Everyone has sewage treatment problems. It is just not the Park Service. I personally think that the Park Service ought to be a shining example, if anywhere in this country, that we are doing things right environmentally. We shouldn't be polluting streams in the Park Service with sewage for foreign visitors to see.

So I would just say that while it is good that we target on the problems we have in the Park Service, this is not just a problem we are facing in the Park Service. We are an aging country, and that age is beginning to show a little bit.

Mrs. CUBIN. Thank you and thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you. Mr. Underwood.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I am glad that you brought some balance to some of the discussion on the issue of the lack of infrastructure and attention to the national parks. I think that the proposed legislation deals with some of the issues attendant to this in a very intelligent way.

Mr. Ridenour, you had the term thinning of the blood and blurring of the lines. I was wondering if you had a term for dealing with the problem of inholdings, especially private land inholdings?

Basically my interest in this issue is prompted by some of the concerns of people on my home island, but if the intent of the legislation is to deal with the issue of how national parks are added, and we know that the Park Service either is not managing as well as perhaps it should be, and that clearly they are not getting funded at appropriate levels to deal with the infrastructure problems, clearly some estimates, between $1 billion and $2 billion, of funds needed to deal with all the inholding questions, what would your thoughts be relative to including some kind of timeframe or some kind of review process on the inholdings issue to be part of this kind of legislation?

Mr. RIDENOUR. Well, it is remarkable how much you learn after you have been Director, and so I have had a chance to do some studying of other systems. And I have studied the English system, and I am presently under consideration to be a part—assist a group that would go over and create a National Park System for Bulgaria. So I have been studying some of the English and European systems, and essentially what they do, which I don't think we would tolerate here in the United States, is they create their parks not by ownership but largely through zoning.

In other words, as I visited the English system and told them how popular the American Park System was, they laughed. And I said, "Why are you laughing?" and they said, "Well, because we are not popular. We do it through zoning." One lady told me she had been trying to get her door painted yellow for 10 years and couldn't get it passed. So, in other words, those beautiful English villages that I love to walk through and hike are kept that way largely through a zoning. And I said I don't think that is going to work in Idaho.

But getting back to your specific question, you know, there are inholders who definitely want to no longer be inholders. And I think we ought to deal with that kind of a problem as we can financially, and they ought to be on a priority list, and it could be made a part of this study. There are people who do not want to be dealt with. They want to be an inholder. Obviously, let us not take on the hard fight unless we absolutely have to.

For example, if an inholder's property is actually threatening a natural or cultural resource in some way, then I think you have to deal with that fairly quickly. That doesn't necessarily mean that you have to buy it. You could buy an easement. You could buy an easement which says, "We are buying away your right to develop it further, and here is the cash for that. But you can continue to live here, and you can continue to stay here under the terms of the easement that you and I would both agree on as a landowner."

So I think easements probably are a direction that—you know, every park superintendent that I have ever known really doesn't like to have inholders. I mean, once the line is drawn around, they would rather get them out. But I think that is something that could be dealt with in a little softer tone and probably work successfully.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I appreciate that very much—especially when there is apparently no interest or it is not high enough of a priority within the National Park Service and you can't deal with it from the congressional end, that some of these inholdings have gone on 20, 25, 30 years, and they are unable to do anything with their property. They conduct title searches. They can't get money. They can't borrow money so it is a serious problem, and it is something that I think fits in line with the kind of broader issues that we are trying to attack through this legislation. Thank you for your comments.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Underwood follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, A U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM GUAM

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing today on H.R. 260, the National Park System Reform Act of 1995. This legislation being introduced by Mr. Hefley along with Mr. Hansen and Mr. Vento, requires the National Park Service (NPS) to construct a strategic plan and determine the agency's priorities. H.R. 260 also increases Congress' oversight of the Park Service in obtaining more park land.

The National Park Service has several financial backlogs of $1 billion to $2 billion and a construction backlog of $6 billion. For years the National Park Service has been criticized for those backlogs. The bill ensures that the NPS does not continue to increase the number of areas it manages when it already has difficulty meeting its current financial obligations. This legislation attempts to improve the way park lands are added to the NPS which have been criticized for some time.

The NPS would be required to submit to Congress a National Park Service System Plan which would include among other items a statement of its goals and objectives and a list of resources to be included in the NPS. These actions will greatly improve the functioning of the NPS, allowing greater congressional oversight and providing clear priorities for the NPS. Not included in this plan is a statement of priority for inholdings acquisition. I believe this would more fully complete the goal of this legislation. Any plan outlining the future objectives of the NPS must include its priorities for the acquisition of inholdings.

We must enable the NPS to better operate the sites it now manages. New sites should be added to the Park Service only after serious consideration and justification. Quality, not quantity, should be the trade mark of our National Park Service. In lieu of this, H.R. 260 creates a responsible procedure for new park land possession.

In enacting this legislation we are not only ensuring a responsible process for the NPS, but allowing the NPS to live up to its obligations. The National Park Service has the opportunity under this legislation to restore its reputation and better manage the land the people have entrusted to it.

I would also like to congratulate Mr. Hefley, Mr. Hansen, and Mr. Vento on the bipartisan effort which has brought this legislation before the subcommittee.

Mr. VENTO. Would the gentleman yield to me on that?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. VENTO. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I just wanted to point out that the Land-Water Conservation Fund supposedly provides $900 million a year. And, of course, we have in most recent years, the last decade, spent only about a third of that, some years far less than that, in terms of trying to provide an orderly manner for the land management agencies, including the Park Service, to actually accomplish the goals. So the funds haven't been appro-

priated there. It has been put on hold. Sometimes they do this through trades or other means than just through cash buyout.

I would also point out that when we do an easement or something less than fee-simple if we designate, the whole issue here is do we designate? Are these significant? Are they important enough? Are we doing this through a proper study and designation? Of course, every issue related to parks will, obviously, manifest itself in this debate.

But the issue of easements actually creates a much more expensive responsibility because if these parks are designated in perpetuity, then you have to administer the easement in perpetuity. And so you can easily look back at land prices in the Blue Ridge which we paid about 66 percent of what the cost would have been in fee-simple in the 1930's, and since the 1930's have been trying to manage—administer the easement. And, of course, it gets into the rather slippery discussion about what constitutes a taking, what is a proper limitation on that land. And so it is very, very expensive when we start saying we are not going to buy this.

There are a lot of different mechanisms that are used, and my colleagues in this committee will quickly learn about life tenancy, about other types of responsibilities or options in terms of how we go about trying to accomplish a nonconfrontational process in terms of achieving or obtaining the land that we are responsible to—that we agree are designated like the Columbus landing site in the Salt River in the Virgin Islands, one, I note, that was cut $2 million by the Appropriations Committee last night. Is that important? Is the Columbus landing site in the Virgin Islands important? I would say so.

Mr. HANSEN. Excuse me.

Mr. VENTO. Time has elapsed.

Mr. HANSEN. The time of the gentleman from Guam has expired. The gentleman from Arizona—Mr. Hayworth.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Professor Ridenour and gentlemen, I appreciate you being here. Professor, one comment in particular that piqued my interest. You advocate several amendments, and you outlined a couple of those for us. Could we revisit that concept of amending the proposed legislation and again have you articulate how you think the legislation might be amended?

Mr. RIDENOUR. I can go through those fairly quickly. They are not too long. Under Title I, 101[a][6], you use the word preservation, and I think you need to be careful using that word preservation because to a certain group of people in this country, preservation means something very, very distinct. And I think you want to add to that word a broader meaning. I don't think the strict interpretation is what you mean by that word. I would add conservation along with preservation in that area where you talk about preservation.

Under Section 101[c], it talks about 3 years of passage of this bill. The Secretary would bring back a report. I don't think you need 3 years. I really think that is longer than you need. The public hearings will take some time, but I would suggest that 2 years would be more than enough time to complete the report. Much of the information you are asking for is already there. In fact, prob-

ably a number of us, including some of you, could walk over to a cafeteria somewhere and have lunch and grind out a bunch of this report by 2 o'clock. So I don't think 3 years is what you need.

Again, I talked about theme areas. I don't think you want to just talk about a specific site but maybe a theme. Are we going to protect artists' homes? Maybe we shouldn't do that at all so we never bring another one up. Are we going to protect—you know, certain theme areas, whatever they might be. So I think that is important.

Under Title II, [c][1], there is a statement that I would change to read, "Possesses nationally significant natural, cultural, or recreational resources that represent one of the most important examples of a particular resource type in the country." I think the way it reads now, you have got it, "Nationally significant natural and cultural," but you leave the door open that a recreational resource wouldn't have to be nationally significant. And that leaves the door open to all kinds of beaches and things that you might pick up that you don't necessarily want.

I am saying, yes, a beach might be preserved, but let us preserve the nationally significant beach, and that might be one beach rather than every beach that a city or local government or a State decides that they can't afford to pay for anymore, and so we will turn it over to the Federal Government. That has been a major problem.

Going back to my New York example, and I am not knocking New York. I am not knocking the need for those beaches in New York. I think they are important. But those beaches are not nationally significant. None of us are probably going to plan our annual vacation to go to those beaches. They are outlets for recreational needs in New York City.

The problem is the money is not in the right place at least when they came in the system. New York at that time was practically bankrupt, and so someone had to hurry up and find a way to keep those beaches open, and so they became Federal property. Those, in my mind, are local functions, and it is a matter of figuring out how to deal with the money rather than change the whole philosophy of the National Park Service.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Professor, thank you very much; other gentlemen. And that is all I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Mr. HANSEN. Mrs. Chenowith.

Mrs. CHENOWITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Pritchard, I am kind of new to this process, and so I would like to know what the National Parks and Conservation Association is and how you are funded?

Mr. PRITCHARD. We are a private citizen organization totally privately funded. We do not seek and we do not normally accept Federal money; however, we, in most instances, donate money to the National Park Service to do studies or other specific projects. We were founded in 1919, primarily by many who were involved in the creation of the National Park Service. Our Board of Trustees has 40 members who are all-private citizens and are respected park authorities, businessmen, and other leaders from around the country.

Mrs. CHENOWITH. I see. And so that is the reason why you are answering for the agency today. Is that correct?

Mr. PRITCHARD. We are answering in our opinion only.

Mrs. CHENOWITH. OK. So it is your opinion that costs are really a secondary factor?

Mr. PRITCHARD. Yes, ma'am. We believe that the cost criteria is inappropriate in determining what is America's heritage. We think that we need to first know what is America's heritage, what is nationally significant, and then we should decide whether we can afford to manage it.

Mrs. CHENOWITH. You mentioned in your testimony that how can you establish a value for Lincoln's birthplace. I want to suggest how appraisers would do this. How do we value a human being's birthplace, whether they are the President of the United States or whether they were an ordinary American that made this country great? Let me tell you how you would do it. You would take the exact same valuation that the Park Service paid for those residents at Cuyahoga Valley whose homes they took and dismantled and burned. That is how an appraiser would look at it.

And, sir, with all due respect, I do want to say that if I sat before an Internal Revenue Service agent and said, "I can't possibly tell you how I have arrived at the assets that I have declared here, and I can't possibly give you an excuse why I have not stated properly what my liabilities are," do you know where I would end up? I am asking you a question.

Mr. PRITCHARD. I am not sure—I would be interested in hearing your opinion where you would end up.

Mrs. CHENOWITH. Well, my bank accounts would be seized, and ultimately I would probably end up behind bars because I did not respond properly to the Internal Revenue Service. And whereas I am not an Internal Revenue Service agent and never will be, I do think that accountability, whether it is with the association or with the agency, is very necessary to the American people. And so I would urge you once again, as I did last week, to give us and encourage the agency to give us an accounting. Although we have made inquiries, we have been not successful so far. So I hope you would help encourage that.

I do want to let you know, in your testimony you mentioned the tall grass prairie in Kansas. I am from Kansas, and 140 million acres of that tall grass prairie would be included. How much money has been spent so far in evaluating the inclusion of this into the National Park Service, and how much of that area is private property?

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mrs. Chenowith, the proposal is for 180 acres. Historically, the area that was tall grass prairie in America is the figure that you used. That is not the area that is being proposed for a park unit. Currently, it is only 180 acres.

Mrs. CHENOWITH. OK. You said in your testimony, "For example, the tall grass prairie ecosystem which once encompassed 140 million acres is a notable missing element of the system."

Mr. PRITCHARD. That is correct. And the proposal which will be submitted by Senator Kassebaum, Senator Dole, Mr. Roberts, Mrs. Meyers, and the Kansas delegation is for an acquisition of only 180 acres.

Mrs. CHENOWITH. But you are still studying the 140 million acres?

Mr. PRITCHARD. No. That was just a figure for reference purposes. It was not at all a study, and I need to clarify one thing. I represent the National Parks and Conservation Association and not the National Park Service. I do not speak for the National Park Service. We, in large measure, support the concerns you have expressed—accountability and concern about procedures. So I know it is confusing between the two organizations, but we are a private citizen organization not in any way connected to the National Park Service.

Mrs. CHENOWITH. I see I do have a red light, but I do want to ask just two very quick questions. One is of Mr. Gale, and, Mr. Pritchard, thank you. One is of Mr. Gale. You mentioned that, "As we understand, the process outlined in Title II of the bill is similar to the process for studying proposed additions to the national wild and scenic rivers."

Mr. GALE. Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. CHENOWITH. Are you proposing inclusion of any wild and scenic rivers?

Mr. GALE. No. We just say that that process seems to work well for that, and we would suggest your consideration of that as to help——

Mrs. CHENOWITH. The process?

Mr. GALE. Yes, ma'am.

Mrs. CHENOWITH. OK. You do say in your testimony, "We are not dismissing the acute need of the nation's urban and rural areas where the National Park Service may have some role to play, but we do question attempts to use the National Park Service as an economic development agency." Can you tell me how many dollars have been spent by the agency in promoting the parks?

Mr. GALE. I cannot, ma'am. I can try to find that information for you.

Mrs. CHENOWITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you. Mr. Pombo.

Mr. POMBO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Ridenour, I want to go back to the line that Mr. Vento was on before, and I guess we can use the tall prairie grass park area as an example. You seem to imply in your statement that it has to be government-owned land in order to preserve it. And with the prairie grass area, I believe that the Nature Conservancy has somewhere in the neighborhood of 30,000 acres that they are preserving in that area right now. Why does the government have to own it if you have a private organization that is basically accomplishing your goal of preserving a large area like that?

Mr. RIDENOUR. I guess my answer to you is that I don't necessarily think that the government has to own it. But let us say that you have a unique either piece of property or the Statue of Liberty or whatever you want to talk about. If it is, in fact, being managed appropriately, I don't necessarily feel that the government has to own it. But in something that unique, I think you have to be in a position at least to take it over if someone decides they are going to bail out of that business if they owned it as a private venture, for example.

You have to have the ability to not allow the last acre to be destroyed, so to speak, and when I say last acre, I mean more than

the last acre of a unique facility. And the government, I think, has to sit in that position, but that doesn't mean they have to own necessarily or own in fee-simple. Sometimes that is the easiest way, but I don't think it necessarily means it has to be.

Mr. POMBO. No. I would agree in many instances it is the easiest way and the correct way to do it, but I will give you another example. Last summer, I was up in northern California, and I spent the day with a park ranger who took me out to one of the most beautiful spots I had ever seen in my life. It was a waterfall in the middle of the Redwoods, and it was a beautiful spot. And we drove up within, oh, probably 100 yards of the spot.

And as we were talking about the area and what was going on, he mentioned that the Park Service had recently acquired that area. And I said, "Well, that is really nice." You know, "I am sure people would love to be able to drive up here and see this." And he kind of laughed, and he said, "They are not going to be able to do that for very much longer." And I said, "Well, why is that?" and he said, "Because we are closing the roads." He said, "The nearest you are going to be able to come to this point is probably about 2 miles away."

Now, throughout history—you know, for as long as we have been around, that has been private property and, obviously, managed in such a way that it maintained its beauty and heritage. And, you know, the trees were still there, and it had been managed properly as private property with the road leading up to it.

Now the Federal Government owned it, and they were going to close off the road. And, you know, I may be able to hike 2 miles to see it, but not very many people can do that. There are not very many people from our cities and older people that can walk 2 miles to even see that or will even attempt to do it.

That is one of the things I fear in, you know, this whole idea that the government has to own all the land in order to preserve it. Well, you know, the private owner that had that was doing a pretty darn good job of preserving it, and I could have driven up there anytime I wanted and seen it. Now the Federal Government owns it, and you can't do that. And, you know, with the prairie grass, you know, it has been private property for a long time, and it still is, obviously, in good enough condition that somebody thinks it is worth preserving. So why does the government have to buy it to preserve it?

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Chairman, may I respond since I am involved with this particular issue? The Nature Conservancy property is private research lands and they limit access to roughly a few weekends every couple of years. Part of the problem for the Nature Conservancy is the liability issue of having hundreds of thousands of people on the property. Therefore, this property that you are referring to in Osage County, Oklahoma, is an important research facility and has the kinds of prairie that the National Park Trust owns in Kansas.

The property that is being proposed for addition to the National Park System, of the 11,000 acres, only 180 acres, the historic core area, would be purchased or somehow possibly donated, and that is still under consideration to the National Park Service. The problem is, as I mentioned, and it would apply to probably this private

land you are referring to, the question of liability of having projected hundreds of thousands of visitors visit the property.

Now, that may be somehow resolved with some other exclusion or protection of a nonprofit, and you may wish to address that. But right now nonprofits are subject to liable actions or legal suits of this type for problems visitors might encounter on private property. So the issue is access, and right now that is not something that a private nonprofit or a private-public agency can adequately handle like the Park Service.

It also relates to law enforcement and interpretation and the cost of maintaining those historic structures. We have some serious problems, which hopefully you will hear from the State Park Director who might address these issues, and then other nonprofits who I am sure would be happy to answer that question. It is a very important one.

Mr. POMBO. I can understand that, and I appreciate the problems in regards to access and liability. But if you get back to the original intent, it was to preserve a tall prairie grass site and because it was deemed by someone to be special and unique and something that we have to preserve. Before somebody made that decision, it was private property and was being maintained in such a way that it preserved whatever it is that you are trying to preserve right now. And there were not hundreds of thousands of people that went to it every year.

You know, I guess the point I am trying to say is if you would have just left it alone, it would still be there. And, you know, it wouldn't have changed, and I think that this attitude that the government has to come in or somebody has to come in to preserve it is really what has led us into this whole problem we have with the National Park Service right now.

We are rushing out there trying to preserve everything from what? It has been there for hundreds of years. It is still there now. It wouldn't have changed. And, you know, we don't have to go in and buy everything. The government doesn't have to go in and buy everything to preserve it.

You know, private property owners have a vested interest in preserving what they have got. It is their livelihood, and if they have preserved it in a good enough way that you think it is unique and special that it should be preserved, then maybe they are doing a good job of preserving it, and we don't have to step in and buy it.

Mr. PRITCHARD. I understand your point, sir. The 1916 enabling legislation directed the Park Service to protect the resources and to provide for the public enjoyment therein. The dilemma that we have is that preservation is not the purpose of the National Park Service.

Mr. POMBO. Do you believe that the intention of the 1916 Act is what is being carried out today with all of the new park acquisitions that we are having? I mean, I look at just what has gone through this place in the 2 years I have been here and the amount of money that has been obligated to purchase those properties. And I think that if you go back to 1916, the original intention of the Act, it had nothing to do with most of the stuff that we have passed out of this Congress since I have been here, let alone what has come out of here in the last 20 years.

So there is a big difference, and I am not saying there is no room for us to ever add anything to the park. I am not saying that. What I am saying is that we have gotten so far afield with all this overriding attitude that we have to come in and preserve everything and buy it up by the Federal Government. I think this is really what has led us into this problem.

Mr. HANSEN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. POMBO. I apologize.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Allard.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Chairman, I don't have any questions. Thank you.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you. Mr. Ridenour, if I may, I want to compliment you on the book that you have written, "The National Parks Compromise: Pork Barrel Politics and America's Treasures." I find in that interesting airplane reading. It is a good book. I would commend it all members of the committee to read that. It is well done, and I found it very interesting. You have come up with some very tantalizing questions.

Let me ask just a couple, if I may, that I think are kind of tantalizing also but very basic. It seems like the consensus of what we are finding on this committee and what we are hearing from the Park Service is the idea that somehow we have to bring the parks with their infrastructure and all their problems up to where the American people want them.

There doesn't seem to be too much question in my mind that the American people want these parks to be very nice, very clean, that the sewer systems work, the water system works, that the roads are nice, that the people are polite, that those who want to go out in the outback can do it, and those that want to walk through the lodges and look at some of the beauties there can do it, and we are very proud of our parks. I think that is a consensus and an opinion that everybody agrees on.

Now, it is easy to go back and point fingers at who didn't do what, and as far as I am concerned, we are going to look ahead. We are going to try to do everything in our power to pick it up from this point, and, you know, you can blame me, blame Bruce, blame anybody—that is easy—but we are through with the blame game around here. I hope we want to say, "OK. Now, what do we do to take care of it?"

One of the criteria that seems to bother me the most is there is just not enough money. I think the gentleman from Minnesota adequately pointed out that more money has come in; you pointed it out; where are we spending the money?

Let me just hit a few very basic things, if I may. Number 1, entrance fees. I am no expert, but I maintain that the best deal in America is a national park. I have used the illustration many times. I take my wife and children to a show and dinner at $60 or $70. I can go to Zion's, Bryce, Yellowstone, Yosemite, and I can plunk down in my trailer and spend a week for nowhere near that amount of money. I have entrance fees, and hookup fees, and things such as that.

And I would like you to respond to this if you would, on entrance fees. If the three of you could give me a quickie on that, I would

appreciate it. And I know there is a great distinction. Mr. Vento and I have argued this ad nauseam of a walk-in park in the East, and a historical park, and one of the drive-to parks of the West. If we should propose rather substantial entrance fee increases, would you give me your response to that? A quick answer from all three of you.

Mr. RIDENOUR. I agree with you. You know, there are some States that fund themselves operationally as much as 100 percent. New Hampshire is a State like that. My own home State of Indiana from entrance fees at their parks fund themselves somewhere in the neighborhood of 65 percent of operational cost. The National Park Service doesn't reach 10 percent.

Mr. HANSEN. Could I stop you just a moment? Add to your comment what if we allowed the local park ranger in charge or the superintendent of the park to keep a percent of it or all of it? How would that respond for the upkeep of that particular park?

Mr. RIDENOUR. I think that helps because one thing it does is adds an incentive for the park director to make sure he has got someone at those gates. If he doesn't have incentive to make sure he has got someone at those gates and all the money is going back to Washington, as soon as there is a problem, the first people he is going to pull is pull the people off the gates that are collecting the funds. So I think you need to build an incentive for that park superintendent to keep people at the gates collecting.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Pritchard, do you have a quick comment on that?

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Chairman, we support the fees legislation. We think the money should go back to the Park Service. Currently it does not. The National Park Service's budget is reduced overall by how much money it receives so there is little incentive to collect fees. We think you should do a separate study on the fees issue, but we would be, and are now fully supportive of, fees legislation.

We also would encourage you to consider a reservation system which does not limit parks to those only who can afford them. Mr. Hefley and I both grew up in the same area, and our families might not have been able to afford visiting national parks if they were very expensive. It was certainly not expensive when we both left our homes in the plains and went to Colorado.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Pritchard, all parks are not created equal. Glen Canyon Recreation Area was projected 200,000 people by the turn of the century. We have that many on July 4. I mean, it is just an amazing thing. The great magnet is Lake Powell—Yellowstone, Yosemite, Great Smokies. Now, compare those to some others and not to play down any parks. How do we make the difference? Have we got a voted leeway like we do in school districts and States? How would you make the difference? Mr. Ridenour?

Mr. RIDENOUR. Let me respond to that. I really think that the only way you can logically do this, and I have thought about this a lot, I really think you ought to create a fee mechanism outside the Park Service and outside of the Congress to bring you recommendations on an annual basis. This is what we did in State government. Every year we changed a little something. We might have changed campground fees. If you are going to require a full

hookup and air conditioning and everything else, that might have gone up 50 cents.

We always tried to keep the theory that somewhere in our system there was going to be campgrounds available to the guy that got laid off at General Motors, and he could bring his family in for $1.50, and if they had a tent they could rough it. But the problem is when you get it in the Congress—for example, I recall that Bill Bradley knocked off the fee for going up to see the Statue of Liberty. No one objected to paying the fee to see the Statue of Liberty, but he knocked that off.

My recommendation to you would be to create—and I hate to talk about creating another committee—you could use the National Parks Advisory Committee that already exists and have them complete a complete fee structure recommendation to you on, say, an every 2-year basis. And so they would come to you every 2 years or 4 years—you pick your number—and say, "This is what we recommend for the entire system," and the Congress would approve or disapprove of it.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Gale, would you like to quickly respond to that comment?

Mr. GALE. I think both gentlemen have adequately covered the topics. I agree with them both, that you need that fee. You need to have the ability to collect fees. It needs to be a sliding scale so that, as former Director Ridenour has said, you are not penalizing the gentleman who has just been laid off work, and you have fees—you know, based on the facilities that are offered or level of facilities that are offered.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Gale, what is your response to the idea of raising fees?

Mr. GALE. Again, I think that is OK as long as you take into consideration that we are not disenfranchising, if you will, any member of the American public to be able to come to a national park area.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you. My time is up, but that was just one consideration. Maybe we would have some later time to go into some more detail. Other considerations for raising money is one of the criteria. If we are going to fix these things, let us be real honest about it. We have got to have a little more money within the system to do it. I think, of course, concessions—the list goes on and on of things we could do. That is one, and I appreciate the response of all of you. I will now turn to Mr. Hefley.

Mr. HEFLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is an outstanding panel, and I really appreciate all of you coming and your responses. Is it my understanding that you all support the legislation, H.R. 260? You have some suggestions about how to make it better but that basically you support the concept. Is that correct?

Mr. RIDENOUR. Yes, sir.

Mr. PRITCHARD. Mr. Hefley, we are concerned about the NEPA exclusion which is a major concern, and we have other recommendations. But we fully support the concept, as we did last year.

Mr. HEFLEY. And, Mr. Gale?

Mr. GALE. As does the Association of National Park Rangers, sir.

Mr. HEFLEY. A question, Mr. Ridenour, that Mr. Doolittle started on and you wanted to respond and didn't get an opportunity to, and that is—because it is a bit of a confusion for us on the committee who are trying to rationalize these things—is that the Department comes and supports many of these added things that we do that we come up with our ingenious ability to discover something that would be really nice back home. And since you are not there anymore, how does that mechanism work?

For instance, the Parks Department was fully supportive of this last year, and Mr. Babbitt the other day says—someone puts a microphone in front of his face and says something about it, and he said, "Oh, we are not closing any parks," and so forth, and so this kind of changes the tone. Is that the way it happens? It kind of comes from the boss, whether it be the President or the head of the Department or something, and then you have to approve it?

Mr. RIDENOUR. Well, sometimes there is a slip of a tongue often regretted at a later time, but that can happen. I think he said something about no loss of parks on his watch.

Mr. VENTO. If the gentleman would yield to me, it is the Office of Management and Budget that is the actual controller of every position.

Mr. HEFLEY. And I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. RIDENOUR. But let me give you an example of how that does happen, and I am going to put a little blame on the National Park Service here because I think I am in a position to do it having been the Director. I had this in remarks I didn't get to—given a mandate to make a study. It is the rare National Park Service planner that cannot wax poetic about the wonders of the subject matter especially when goaded by the local office of the congressional staff.

So you have got a planner—maybe they have been in the Park Service for 2 or 3 years. They have been assigned to look at this particular project in New Jersey, and the local staff of the congressman is wining and dining them. You know, they can get real enthusiastic about it, and so they get to the Director's office, and the Director gets a briefing about 10 minutes before it is time to come to the congressional hearing.

In the meantime, that staff planning document has been surfaced—somehow it has gone underground and popped up in the hands of the members of the committee up here before the Director even sees it. So, you know, I am not suggesting that always happens, but that happens a lot.

Mr. HEFLEY. In the mosaic of our parks in this country, and by mosaic, Mr. Pombo raises the issue there are some private parks. I think everyone would agree that Disneyland is a park. It is a private park. So it is part of our overall park recreational experience in this country.

But in that mosaic, has it helped or hurt the fact that the Federal Government seems to be increasingly taking over either municipal parks or state parks to put it under Federal control? You talked about the New York beaches and so forth. Has that helped the overall mosaic of parks in this country, or has it actually hurt because we don't have the resources to maintain some of our really fine Federal parks as we have shown?

Mr. RIDENOUR. I think it has hurt. I think it has definitely hurt. And I would suggest that the only reason that happens is that the State and local governments don't have the printing press. I mean, the printing press is in Washington. That is where the printing press prints money. That is where deficits occur.

Many of these State and local governments have budget amendments that don't allow them to go into debt. So when they get into trouble, they look up here because essentially the printing presses could still run and keep them going. And what it has done, it has taken the actual responsibility, which has always been thought of as local government responsibility, and they really don't want to lose. But they have lost, and they have lost a little bit of their dignity at the same time, and they passed it up the line to the Federal Government. And I think that has hurt the system. It has hurt the local system, and it has hurt the Federal system at the same time.

Mr. HEFLEY. Would you agree with that, Mr. Pritchard?

Mr. PRITCHARD. Sir, I think Mr. Gale's testimony was very important. If you heard what he said, a number of the proposals, probably over 50 percent, have not been approved by Congress. They either didn't merit inclusion or Congress, for whatever reason, did not authorize those areas.

I think we have to look at this in the historical perspective. The National Park System is comprised of less than 3 percent of the public land of America. The world standard is close to 10 percent. The National Park Service does a superb job of carrying out the mandate given to it by Congress, not by an Administration. So I think we need to be careful that we look at this in the broader perspective, and not just a sense of the last 10 years.

I believe the National Park Service's role and mission is totally separate from other recreation operations such as Disneyland. Mr. Ridenour suggests preservation is what the law says, but I think it is clear that the purpose is to preserve the resources for this and future generations and to provide for the public enjoyment. We believe that also means education.

I think if we give the National Park Service a job, they do a great job of it. I also think we are at a point where we need to clean up some problems that have evolved from expansion of the Park System since 1980. But I think in the longer term, the issues that are addressed in your bill are the important ones—what are the standards, what are the issues we need to deal with, and was something added a couple of years ago? I don't think we are going to exclude that many when we get through, and I know you feel that also.

I think what is important is the plan, as you and Mr. Vento have said, for how we go about adding and monitoring the National Park System for the 21st century. So I hope we move in, as the Chairman has suggested, that positive direction, and I hope that is the direction of this bill.

Mr. RIDENOUR. I think this legislation will help the Park Service a great deal because it will give them some direction that for lack of a better term they have not felt for a number of years.

I would also say this in all candor, I think the Executive Branch for many years—and I am not just talking about the last 10 years, I am talking about the Executive Branch—basically stepped away

from the responsibility of running the National Park Service. And it essentially became a captive of the Congress during those years in lack of any movement of any kind from the Executive Branch.

So I put a fair amount of blame on the Executive Branch for not standing up and providing leadership in terms of direction for the Park Service. So the Congress kind of moved in and filled a vacuum in the 1970's and the 1980's, and that is when you see a lot of parks got added—the old talk about a Phil Burton's park-of-the-month club, and whatever showed up, that was fine with him. It was a political tool.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Gale, Mr. Pritchard, Mr. Ridenour, I really appreciate your contribution to this debate. It has been very, very meaningful, and I appreciate it very much.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you, Mr. Hefley. Mr. Allard.

Mr. ALLARD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. After the comment from Mr. Pritchard, I decided maybe I did have a question or two. You talked about your opposition to excluding the National Environmental Protection Act, NEPA, and you were concerned about that. If we have within the parks, we have decided the purpose there is preservation, why do we need to have an environmental impact statement on a national park? It seems to me like it is an unnecessary requirement in the fact that parks are set there with a definite preservation goal, and why do we step in and add another layer of bureaucracy for the local operating officers and managers?

Mr. PRITCHARD. Congressman, our concern is not with the additions which now are required and the changes in management policy, but with deauthorizing a park unit. We believe that needs to comply with NEPA, and we believe that the public review process and the documents that may not be addressed by this process should be available. The public should be assured that they were, in fact, addressed.

Mr. ALLARD. So if we eliminate a park, you want to have an environmental impact statement on that?

Mr. PRITCHARD. That would be correct, sir. That is what is required now by law and we would ask that that law be followed, and it would meet the criteria of NEPA.

Mr. ALLARD. Why would that be a particular problem just because you have eliminated the designation? It seems to me that there are other ways to come about that. I mean, if you have a project or something and you are required to have that now or—see, I don't understand the logic of why you need to have that.

Mr. PRITCHARD. The criteria for conducting an environmental impact statement is a significant Federal action that might affect the environment. The transferring or deauthorizing a park, we believe, would meet that criteria. That is our recommendation.

Mr. ALLARD. For somebody to object on environmental grounds, all they have to do is pay $25, isn't it, to file a complaint or concern?

Mr. PRITCHARD. I don't know what the price is, so I could not respond to that.

Mr. ALLARD. I think that is relatively simple for anybody. I mean, they may not even be related to the park. They may be in Florida, and the park may be in the State of Washington—may not have any direct relationship to that park and not have a real inter-

est. Why should they have an impact on what happens to that park? I mean——

Mr. PRITCHARD. Well, sir, I would disagree with you. I believe the parks belong to all the people, and, therefore, anyone should have the right to participate in that process. You don't have to let the process go on forever though. There are deadlines where they have to submit their comments, and the process works very effectively right now with few exceptions.

I think, for example, for me not to have the right to comment on excluding a portion of Yellowstone would be a major concern and would occur if you have this NEPA exclusion. So we would encourage you to look at the parks as belonging to all the people and give all the people, as Mr. Young has suggested, an opportunity to participate in that process.

Mr. ALLARD. What has been pointed out to me by a staff person is that actually what is in the bill, that wouldn't apply to the closing of it but would apply more to the process later on—the identification. And so, you know, I guess I have a little bit of a problem with your concerns.

And one other thing I wanted to follow up is that the parks are available to all people. What do you do with these parks that are so overwhelmed with visitors? How do you limit visiting to those parks?

Mr. PRITCHARD. Congressman, our recommendation is that a fee structure be put in place, but we don't think that should exclude visitors. As I mentioned before, we believe there should be a reservation system so that everyone has an opportunity to know that if they are planning a vacation they will be able to visit that park. The current situation, a first-come first-serve policy, creates quite a deal of concern for a lot of people. So, we recommend a reservation system for at least 75–80 percent of the visitors, with the remaining being accommodated on a first-come first-serve basis.

Finally, we have developed a procedure called Visitor Impact Management, and encouraged the Park Service to do likewise. They are now in a review process to determine how many visitors should be allowed in a park given the infrastructure and the resources that are there.

Mr. ALLARD. So in reality, it can't be available to everybody, can it?

Mr. PRITCHARD. That is correct.

Mr. VENTO. Would the gentleman yield to me? The gentleman is almost done. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLARD. Yes.

Mr. VENTO. OK. I just would say this whole carrying capacity issue—I know that your time has expired—but the carrying capacity issue, I think it is a question here of is there an absolute carrying capacity or is there a funding problem? And I guess I think that looking at some of the busiest parks, including Yosemite and some of the other spots—you know, if you go to the Valley, you have got a problem. If you go to other—Tullery Meadows or someplace, you don't. So the issue, I think, is having adequate funding. I mean, the Virgin Islands—the tour ships are going to stop, and you have got to deal with the other problem.

Mr. ALLARD. I disagree. I am reclaiming my time. I disagree with the gentleman, that the issue is not funding. The issue is the fact that there are too many people visiting the park. There are not the physical capabilities there to maintain it. And many times the administrative direction of the park is such to make fewer facilities available to the park, and sometimes it is just too much traffic or too much tourism or whatever.

Mr. VENTO. If the gentleman would continue to yield?

Mr. ALLARD. I will yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. VENTO. Again, I don't want to end that or start that debate. I just think it is an issue that we ought to recognize in terms of joining, that not everybody here just agrees, and I don't. I think it is mostly a funding problem spreading out the use in terms of some of those parks.

For instance, Mr. Pombo commented about the waterfall in the Redwoods Park. The issue is, can you drive right up to the rim of the Grand Canyon? Some people think they ought to all be able to take their car up there, but sometimes it means if you want to preserve what is there or you want to conserve—pardon me, I didn't mean to use that nasty word—if you want to conserve it, you need to change how you use it.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask just for a minute to comment on——

Mr. ALLARD. I reclaim my time, and yield back to the Chairman.

Mr. VENTO. And I would ask the gentleman just for 1minute to——

Mr. HANSEN. If the gentleman would suspend for just a moment? I am going to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota for 1 minute. I want to thank the panel for their excellent testimony. Keep in mind we want to give you some questions; if you would respond. Things like Presidio and other things we wanted to get into. We didn't have time. We will then recess for this vote on the rule, and then we will excuse you and thank you, and we would ask the other panel if they wouldn't mind coming up and being in their places when we get back. We should be gone about 5 minutes. So I will yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, thank you. I have been trying to control myself throughout this hearing. I don't know. My colleagues may not think I have done very well, but believe me. The issue, I think, is one of mission between the agencies, notwithstanding what has been said. I think, secondly, in terms of the issue of how the parks came to be and the private sources today, Monticello, Mount Vernon are private entities. Is there any question in this room but that there is national significance to George Washington's home or to Jefferson's home?

And that points out the second issue in terms of the growth of the parks here which may not be apparent to everyone that is present, and that is the change from not just natural sites but to cultural—including cultural historic sites as probably most often we think of them. And that has happened.

That was a change in terms of the mission. And that, of course, opens up the door to many, many other sites. And I would just suggest that even some of the natural parks end up with cultural sites in them.

In fact, one of the problems with the aging infrastructure and structures is that some of it actually ends up having historic value under the historic preservation law. So, I mean, this is the sort of dilemma we are getting into. And defining and setting forth that path is, of course, the challenge that we all face in this legislation and our future actions.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you. We will stand in recess. This gives you a chance for a seventh-inning stretch. We will be back.

[Recess.]

Mr. HANSEN. I call the committee to order. If Dr. Robin Winks, Professor at Yale University, Mr. Dale Murphy, Director of California State Parks, and Mr. Harry McPherson, an attorney, if they would please come forth, we would appreciate it. Thank you so much.

You were here, I assume, during the last go. If you will notice that the green light—when that goes on, you have got 5 minutes. The yellow light tells you to wrap it up, and the red light asks you if you would please stop. I would appreciate it if you would abbreviate your comments.

And let me just say this. All of the things that you are going to say, your prepared testimony will be in the record, and it will be read, believe me. So we again thank you for coming and appreciate your presence here. And, Dr. Winks, we will turn to you, sir.

STATEMENT OF ROBIN WINKS, PROFESSOR, YALE UNIVERSITY

Mr. WINKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On the principle that my submitted testimony will be in the record, I intend not to read it but to comment on it very briefly and move on to two other points that are not in the testimony but, in part, arise from my listening to the testimony this morning.

I am here as a private individual, not representative of any group. I am a member of the Board of the National Parks and Conservation Association, and I am a historian who is the Chairman of the Studies in the Environment Program at Yale University. I have also been on the National Parks Advisory Board and twice as Chair and on the Presidio Council.

I suspect I am before you, however, because I have been spending some time writing a book on the evolution of the national park ethic. And because I know firsthand of the various changes in definitions of units and quality, and because I am the leading "national park groupie," as one Director of the National Park Service once said, in the sense that I have been to all but 14 of the 368 units of the National Park System. So perhaps unlike others who have testified before you, I have seen these problems up front.

I support this bill in principle. I feel it has 4 grave problems with it, and I will conclude by indicating those in a few minutes. But there is no doubt that there are now units in the National Park System that are unworthy by whatever criteria you use. They lack national standards. These units lack historical integrity. These units often invite people for primarily recreational purposes which is not why the National Park Service was created.

I could, I think, readily, having visited all of the units except those in Alaska, draw up a private list of as many as 20 that should be stricken. I will not supply that list because I think it is

irresponsible at this point to engage in "hit lists". The purpose of this bill clearly is for a systematic examination of the system, and in doing so, for inquiries into the individual units. But I can indicate the kinds of units that are inappropriate and why I think they are so.

The reason I support the bill in principle—and I agree with Paul Pritchard that it is the most significant legislation that has come before Congress since the original Act of 1916 with the possible exception of the Act of 1970—the reason I support it is because I believe that the National Park System of the United States is not only the largest (demonstrably so), but the most elegant and the best managed National Park System in the world, and I wish to see it continue to be so. It is strapped for money, and the Park Service has frequently informed Congress of this.

Many of the inappropriate units were produced through political clout by Congress. I too studied all of the proposals put before the National Park Service in the 1930's. There were roughly 100 such proposals, and the Park Service acted favorably on less than 10 percent of them. Most of these proposals came from Congress responding to requests by Chambers of Commerce in their home States.

I have also studied the enabling legislation for virtually all the 368 units, and as you Members of Congress fully understand, several of these units were thrust upon the National Park Service contrary to its own studies. The Steamtown factor, which is often referred to, points to a unit which the Park Service itself did not wish to acquire and attempted to hold at arm's length through a process of affiliation in its initial 2 years.

The other unit that *USA Today* singled out, the Charles Pinckney unit in South Carolina, was thrust upon the Park Service before the Park Service could even complete its own historical assessment. And now, of course, it has been found that the property there consists of a house built in 1842 after Charles Pinckney was dead, and, therefore, it is impossible that he lived in it.

Therefore, I welcome this bill because I think it will discipline Congress, and it will help the National Park Service, which, on occasion, has accepted without protest properties it should not have done, to discipline itself as well.

But consider how sweeping the bill is. There are 156 national parks in the States represented by the members of this committee. In those States, eight additional national parks have already been deaccessioned. There are 12 in Utah, 10 in Colorado, 5 in Minnesota. Three in Colorado were deaccessioned over the years because there were once 13. If one is going to consider at all the deaccessioning park units, one must do them one by one with great care.

I fear elements in the bill and, therefore, would not support the bill as it now stands. Let me point, if I may, to just four of those elements. First, the title of the bill. I believe what is involved here is not reform, which implies that the National Park Service is disastrously in need of reshaping, but rather I believe the bill should be the National Park System Review Bill or Reassessment Bill.

Second, I dislike page 4 line 14 deeply, and I fear the reference to "and portions of units." If this is actually held to, this will re-

quire 368 boundary studies. This is impossible, and here I would have to take exception to what former Director Ridenour suggested. It is impossible to conduct such studies in the time that is being allowed.

Many would fear that this provision is an opportunity to reopen doors over debates about boundaries that we thought were long closed. Certainly, if portions of units are to be examined, then the entire unit should be examined with respect to the necessity to add land as well as to subtract land to make it a wholer and more nearly perfect expression of the purpose for which it was created.

There are several references in the bill to management by someone other than the National Park Service. I feel very strongly that if the National Park Service is not the manager, the unit is not a national park. I myself think that all of the so-called affiliated units, of which I believe there are now 22, should be disaffiliated or brought into the Park System because this category has created second-class citizens.

I do not think that any unit that is deaccessioned should be thrown away, as it were. It should be passed to the State as a good state park or to others who would look after it because there must have been an important point to it when it was created. But, clearly, if the "national park" is still to be the label applied to a unit, it must be managed by those, the NPS, who do manage so well.

Finally, I too share the objection to two of the criteria. One is cost and the other is access. Earlier today, we heard something about Rembrandts. A Rembrandt is very expensive. If one has decided one wants a Rembrandt, one does not, frankly, ask what the cost is. If one wants the finest example of a particular landscape or the best representation of a historical theme, cost cannot be an important criterion. Nor can access.

After all, there are many great art galleries and museums that in order to protect the resource must keep people from having undue access to it. And to suggest that an Aniakchak National Monument is not worthy merely because it is extremely difficult to get to is to miss the point of the highly systematic National Park System in this country.

Let me close by reading five sentences on the question of national significance. There seems to be a great debate over this, and I think national significance is capable of being defined.

Before doing so, let me remind you that it is very clear that the Act of 1916 put protection ahead of access. I have done a legislative history of that Act. I think I am the only person to have done so, and I can assert on the basis of that legislative history that those two so-called contradictory mandates were listed by the legislators in the order of priority. If this is accepted, then the Park System units should be superlative examples of landscapes and historical experiences.

I close, therefore, with these five sentences; Units of the National Park System must represent the finest possible example of a given landscape, natural environment, or historical or cultural resource in the nation. (No more regionally significant or locally significant parks.) A national park unit must be a place of very substantial retained integrity (no more historical reconstructions. No modified Disneyland.)

It must be a place capable of such interpretation as to make clear to the lay public why it is worth preservation; it must be a place that is richly unique, nonrepetitive of themes and precise ecologies found elsewhere. And, finally, it must be a place that is managed by our premier manager of such landscapes and historical places, the National Park Service.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify before this committee, especially to a bill that has been put forward by Congressmen Hefley and Vento. Having grown up in Monte Vista, Colorado, and often gone to Colorado Springs, it is a pleasure to be able to, I hope, help protect Bent's Fort, Florissant Fossil Beds, and the Great Sand Dunes. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Winks can be found at the end of the hearing.]

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you, Dr. Winks. Mr. Murphy.

STATEMENT OF DONALD MURPHY, DIRECTOR, CALIFORNIA STATE PARKS

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is really a pleasure to be here. My comments will run a little bit differently. We were faced with a similar situation that faces the National Park Service now, and I wanted to share with you some of the methods that we used to face a similar challenge.

Our park system is composed of 270 units, encompassing about 1.3 million acres in the State of California, and last year 66 million people visited those lands. We believe we manage an eminently successful system which is second only to the National Park Service of the United States in its acreage and diversity.

Three years ago, we were faced with a $20 million deficit and the specter of closing parks. Governor Wilson approved a plan that significantly reduced the administrative overhead, eliminating an entire layer of administration in the California Park Service and a reduction of 183 positions. This action saved California taxpayers $10 million, and it was all accomplished without closing a single park unit.

Governor Wilson also directed the California State Parks to divest itself of parks that were not of statewide significance, and we were able to transfer units to city and county governments and enter into operating agreements with others. We were further challenged to form public and private partnerships, to become more entrepreneurial in our management of California State Parks as well.

Toward this end, we have developed an aggressive marketing and public relations program. The program includes the opening of State park stores in several locations across the State, public service announcements by State park spokesperson, Clint Eastwood, and development of park merchandise which is sold by catalog and in our stores.

We have developed a sponsorship program patterned after the successful 1984 L.A. Olympics. The sponsors will pay a fee to California State Parks for being an official sponsor, and we are negotiating our first large sponsorship with a national beverage company.

Governor Wilson also designated State parks to participate in a pilot program in performance based budgeting. As a result, the de-

partment has developed a strategic plan with clear goals and tactics and criteria. This includes an analysis of the services we provide and to what standard. And this system of budgeting ensures that we clearly define our mission and that we stick to that clearly defined mission.

The formation of bioregions in the State of California has also allowed the department to partner with agencies such as BLM, the U.S. Forest Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service. These partnerships emphasize management of resources by ecological systems rather than by jurisdictions, and many economies have been realized as a result. Our most significant partnership that I am here to talk about is with the National Park Service.

Just a brief comment. Throughout the history of California, its management policy, administrative philosophies, and goals have closely paralleled those of the National Park Service. Individuals imbued with the park philosophy include luminaries such as Steven Mather, who has advised both park systems at critical moments in our development. Two of my predecessors, Newton B. Drury and William Penn Mott, Jr., have subsequently served as Directors of the National Park Service.

More recently, State park units such as those at the Marin Headlands, Stinson Beach, and our historic ship collection have been transferred as building blocks to create the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

In this tradition, beginning in May of 1993, discussions between Stanley Albright, Jr., the National Park Service's Western Region Director, and me led to a decision to explore potential joint operational improvements and cost savings that might be achieved between the adjacent State and national parks.

In the course of conversations over the Redwood National and State Parks, both agencies recognized that they had units in close proximity in other California locations which could benefit from closer cooperation. To explore the potential for increased cooperation, the National Park Service and California State Parks appointed the California Coordinated Committee on Operational Efficiencies.

A large number of the recommendations of this committee has been initiated and completed. But perhaps the most important part of this is the focus on cooperation has resulted in unforeseen opportunities which have allowed significant initiatives on the part of the responsible field individuals who have employed the cooperative relationship to further the public interest unforeseen by the original committee.

Last April, Director Kennedy and I signed what might be termed the master or umbrella Memorandum of Understanding between my department and the western region of the National Park Service designed to carry out the recommendations of the California Coordinating Committee on Operational Efficiencies for increased coordination and efficiencies between our two Services.

Specifically, this agreement adopts the recommendation of the committee's report, authorizes the development of interpark and interagency agreements. To guarantee that this program is carried forward in a responsible manner, a system of oversight including regular reports and evaluations has been initiated. In less than a

year, we have made significant progress in the implementation of the recommendations.

In conclusion, faced with many of the problems now being addressed by the subject legislation, the California Department of Parks and Recreation instituted steps directed toward situation resolution. Employing a multifaceted approach, we entertained a host of ideas including improving operations to achieve increased efficiencies.

The most important part of this bill, in our estimation, is really the fact that you have an opportunity to be strategic here. And a Park Closure Commission concept may have merit where all available approaches are used in evaluation of the national parks and which result in a multiplicity of solutions other than a single preconceived method.

Park closure, we would like to submit, is but one part of an overall strategy of restructuring which must include such methods as park transfers, internal restructuring, public/public and public/private agreements, and creative relationships with private entrepreneurs. We must look to all available solutions if we are to provide our country with viable parks, necessary resource protection, and recreational opportunities into the next century for future generations of all Americans.

My testimony has been submitted in full, and I would be happy to answer questions when it comes time. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Murphy can be found at the end of the hearing.]

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. McPherson.

STATEMENT OF HARRY MCPHERSON, ATTORNEY, VERNER, LIIPFERT, BERNHARD, McPHERSON, & HAND

Mr. MCPHERSON. Mr. Chairman, of all those you have heard today, I know the least about this issue. And I am here not because I am familiar with the Park System and its problems, but because I served on the Base Closure Commission in 1993 where I think I had the opportunity to meet with you, sir, and particularly because I have some thoughts on the process by which the Base Closure Commission was empowered to act.

I must say that on listening to this morning's testimony, I am persuaded that your legislation, insofar as it has this structure to it that H.R. 260 embodies, is pretty wise. But let me just make a couple of comments and perhaps going over old ground that you have already traversed since last year since your bill then.

The Base Closure Commission idea has worked for these 4 years that it has been in being for three or four essential ideas. It has been well managed. It had a terrific Chairman, your old friend, Jim Courter, and it was well staffed.

But the main reason why it worked is that the country understood, the entire government, the Congress, the Executive Branch, everyone who looked at the base situation in the aftermath of the Cold War understood that we had too many bases to be afforded, and that we needed to reduce those bases.

We also understood that the Congress could not be expected to eliminate those bases. It was extremely hard for Congress to deal with that. It was a matter of macho almost for members to fight

for their base and to win it for very good reasons. It is very understandable. But those two contradictions required inventing something like the base closure process. So you had a national conviction that base closure was needed and a national belief, and certainly a congressional belief, that closure would not be accomplished by the Congress left to itself.

And so people were willing to permit a group of outsiders, a group of civilians to exercise what is almost authoritarian powers to close bases, almost authoritarian because we were not and never were a trial court. We were not a petty jury to look at the issues in the first instance and decide which bases to close. We were an appellate court. We sat and looked at a list of proposed closures and realignments that we got from the Pentagon, and we looked at them in the light of eight criteria which the Congress and the Pentagon had agreed to beforehand.

So the process was understanding that you had to have this kind of process, development of criteria and agreement on those criteria, development of a list from the Pentagon, submission of the list to the commission, the commission's OK of its own list, which it submitted to the President, and then went to Congress where Congress could only vote it up or down, could not pick and choose. There was no cherry-picking involved, and that is the way it has worked in 1991 and 1993 and is about to work in 1995.

Your proposal in H.R. 260, as I understand it, is that the Interior Department would have the job of deciding what parks ought to be closed or changed, modified in some way and would then have that role under the criteria that you have spelled out here on page 4 and 5. Those are really quite essential, that they be as specifically characterized in the report language that you use as you could possibly make it because Interior needs to have your idea of what it is that you are looking for in parks to be closed, and then it needs to do the job.

Finally, if they don't do the job in a certain period of time, you give it to a commission which does not have BRAC powers, does not have the powers that we had in the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. This commission would merely do what Interior failed to do, come up with a list, and then give it to you. The hot potatoes would still be in your hands.

But in light of the many political considerations that you have talked about here, where people have fought for national parks and historic areas in their districts, perhaps that is a wise way to go. I think it is the wise way until the country has come to the conclusion that it came to at the outset of the defense process.

[The prepared statement of Mr. McPherson can be found at the end of the hearing.]

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you very much. We thank the panel for their excellent testimony. I hope you folks realize that Mr. McPherson did sit on the BRAC Commission, did an admirable job there, a terribly tough assignment; appreciate the great work you did there even though all of us who lost bases, of course, have a little heartburn with what happened on that particular thing, but it was necessary, and we are all holding our breath for the 1995 round of BRAC.

I think you have drawn a very clean comparison between the two approaches that we are taking to this, and the one that has bothered a lot of us is putting it back to Congress. And I don't know how that is all going to work out, but we are working on it. Mr. Hefley.

Mr. HEFLEY. Thank you, and I too, Mr. Chairman, thought this was, again, an excellent panel and excellent testimony, and I thank each and every one of you. Mr. Winks, I thought as I was listening to your testimony that for a Yale professor this guy talks with a lot of sense, and then I find out you have excellent roots and so that explained it to me.

And I do thank you for not sharing with us your hit list. That is the thing that the press has really wanted. "What parks are you talking about?" Well, we are not. We are not talking about parks, and you expressed that very well. We are not talking about any specific parks. We are talking about a system, a method to bring some rationale into this.

You have expressed some concern though about the cost factor. You wouldn't—maybe you would. Let me ask, would you just completely discount cost? For instance, I would use your analogy a little bit about a Rembrandt. And if we talk about national defense, the argument can be that, well, the defense of the nation—cost should not be considered in the defense of the Nation because that is the most important thing a government does.

But, of course, I think most of us would say, yes, you would have to consider the cost. Do you need heavy lift? Do you need a C–17? Or is there another way to do it? If you have a bomber force, do you need a B–2, which costs a lot of money, half a billion dollars, or could you do it cheaper? So that comes in as a factor. So would you completely discount cost in our consideration?

Mr. WINKS. Congressman Hefley, no, I wouldn't completely discount cost at all. I was at that moment in a peroration in which I was making a statement of principle, and that is that cost should not be a factor as important as the others, but certainly it should be considered without any doubt.

Mr. HEFLEY. Thank you very much. Mr. Murphy, I was fascinated by the innovative approach that you seemed to have taken in California to solve your problems out there. You actually did get rid of some units of the California Park System and spun them off to cities, counties, and so forth?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes. That is correct, and I really have to put that in context because it is interesting what is happening in California now with many of the counties and cities strapped for funds. They also come to us and ask us will we take some of their units. And you can expect the same thing here with the National Park Service that you would find as you sought to transfer units that were not of national significance. As Dr. Winks has described, there are perhaps 20 or more out there. I think you would be hard-pressed to sometimes find takers.

So we were able to do that in California under particular circumstances, and we had to be very strategic about it, but we were able to do that. It is certainly not a panacea. That is why in my conclusion I emphasize that it really has to be a multifaceted approach.

Mr. HEFLEY. But you didn't sell off the California Park System?

Mr. MURPHY. Oh, not at all.

Mr. HEFLEY. You still have a wonderful park system in California, and that is what we would hope for the Federal system.

Mr. MURPHY. Absolutely, and not unlike the Park Service, I mean, we were faced with exactly the same situation where over the years we have acquired properties that are not of statewide significance as a result of what we in California and the legislature call members requests which come in late and get attached at the last minute onto the budget bill. And over the years we have ended up acquiring a considerable amount of property that way.

Mr. HEFLEY. Thank you. Mr. McPherson, I suppose it would be inappropriate to talk to you about Lowery, wouldn't it? In fact, I will be chairing a committee on our oversight role in Armed Services on the base closure process here at 2:30 p.m., and I am glad to have you here to see this crossover.

As I understood, the way we set that up, you were an appellate court system; it really was not designed to pick and choose other bases to close necessarily except mainly to review the process like an appellate court would and see if the Defense Department did the right process.

And yet the last round of base closures, it seemed to me that you guys threw out a lot of bases on a list; got a lot of communities around the country all excited and then mostly didn't do anything with that except for the one situation that the Air Force still gripes about in New Jersey where they wanted to get rid of that metropolitan base. And could you talk about that a little because I think it has some implications for what we are talking about?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Sure. What Mr. Hefley is talking about is the commission's decision about midway through to add a lot of bases to look at, and it was the result of a kind of runaway logic. I mean, I still think we did the right thing, but the idea was that if you were going to close—if one base was on the list and was in a class with several other bases—for example, McClellan Air Force Base in Sacramento is an Air Force depot. There are four others. And a member from Sacramento made the very compelling case that, "Before you close us, at least take a look at the other four and weigh us in the light of the other four."

So we put all those on the list, as you say, terrorizing half the country. People who thought they were OK when they had gotten through the Pentagon, suddenly found themselves added to the list because of us. I don't believe we added any bases to be closed as a result of that, but we made the people who were on the list perhaps feel that they had had a fairer shake because at least they had been compared to similar bases.

Mr. HEFLEY. OK. Thank you very much, and I see our time is up, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HANSEN. There will be another round if both you gentlemen would request it. Mr. Vento.

Mr. VENTO. Well, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the patience. I know the Director is waiting, and the witnesses have done an excellent job of testimony. I paid attention especially to the last comment of Mr. McPherson's insights into this, and the fact that he said that Mr. Hefley was wise, I think, is very helpful in terms of

the legislation before us. We crafted it. I didn't know that we would use that word to describe our actions, but we are happy to have whatever positive input we could get, and I think it is all very constructive.

Mr. Winks did an excellent job with his testimony, Mr. Chairman; talked about the word reform. One of my colleagues gave me a definition. He said the word reform is used when you are not able to justify on the merits what you are doing—the issue of reform.

I think the point Mr. Winks made just to amplify the issue of—and I have tried to use it as I have considered parks, not to consider the economic impact of the park but to say, yes, that as a goal, if we don't have the Mojave Desert type represented in the Park System, then that ought to be included as such and whether or not it is accessible, whether there are roads; obviously, looking at what there is available in terms of Mojave, whether that was the best choice or not. Of course, I think that that is obviously an arguable point. But there are areas that have not been included that should, and so we should be willing to do that.

We are sort of set here, and I might say, Mr. Murphy, I especially noted your comments as director of the California Park System, with regards to States. And it sort of brought up in my mind's eye the tremendous partnership that there has been between the States and the National Park Service in terms of establishment and, in fact, even some of the other land management agencies.

You know, it is always sort of interesting to look at when the States actually gave deaccessioned land back to the national government, the national forest, because they were concerned about the protection of watersheds. And, you know, some of our parks—I know specifically the Everglades, and you have mentioned some with regard to Redwoods—really came about because the States actually donated some of the corpus of what was and what became the Everglades National Park in the Everglades.

So it is almost an act of design saying we have got to get this together. The national government has the organization. As a matter of fact, the first national government presence in some of those California parks was on the part of the U.S. Military to guard and to protect Yellowstone or Yosemite in the case of California. Obviously, they understood the protection and the capacity to do this was not something that necessarily lent itself to a State. And so this is nothing new, I guess, Mr. Chairman, and members.

I would point out to you, in fact, that if you would look at the genesis of how these parks came about in terms of private philanthropy, we have had some examples of that in the recent year with regard to Marsh Billings and the site in Connecticut. So I think there is much to gain here.

Now, as far as the whole concept of a commission, I think that, again, the excellent testimony of Mr. McPherson pointed this out. But one of the elements he didn't point out is that in the 1990's there seems to be this rush to judgment for Congress to give up responsibilities and the role.

It is sort of curious, I mean, because some of the actions that we have taken, and, I mean, you can search your own conscience, my colleagues, do, in essence, say, "Well, Congress, this is a lousy proposal, but under the circumstances, we have to do this because it

is a bad idea whose time has come." I have heard that more than once in recent years with regards to constitutional amendments and other activities—a bad idea whose time has come. Well, I don't know how many bad ideas you have whose time has come, but I would suggest if we proceed down that path, that that is a problem.

And so if we give up roles—I think the other issue here that we are faced with, and I think you perceive it properly, Mr. McPherson, a very fundamental thing. With the military, you had a different mission. What is the change in mission here? Is there a change in mission of what the Park Service is going to be? And that is why I referred to that point, and I think it is an issue in terms of mission.

But, if anything, the Forest Service, BLM, other land management agencies, Fish and Wildlife, and some States, are taking part of the mission that usually was reserved for the Park Service. So I guess the question, do we need a Park Service? Are we really going to, you know, devolve back into these others?

But I think the issue here is that the Park Service is so wildly popular, endorsed by the public and the members, that many of them want to get their assets under the National Park Service blanket. I mean, that is what the issue is. And the question is who are we going to let under this umbrella and who are we not going to? And have we brought some things in that either through one way or another like fallen wood in the petrified forest is being picked up, and it hasn't been protected? There are a lot of ways to end up with a problem here in terms of the basic reason it was designated.

And so I apologize for not asking questions of you, but I did want to endorse your comments and amplify them, and if you had any comments briefly, maybe the Chairman will let you answer them.

Mr. HANSEN. Dr. Winks, did you want to respond to Mr. Vento's comments?

Mr. WINKS. Well, I would like to make two comments. I basically endorse all that Congressman Vento has said. I would like to go back to something I observed by Mr. McPherson that Congressman Vento touched upon, and that is it is my understanding that there were extensive public hearings relating to base closing. And I don't see that this bill provides, at least it certainly doesn't mandate—it does have a reference to where appropriate—for such public hearings.

If the closing of a base had economic impact, so too will the closing of a national park unit. I have already testified that I am not opposed to that. But it does seem to me that that being so, if one were to remove the Presidio, if one were to close Steamtown, clearly, there will have to be public hearings of the kind that followed upon the base closings or preceded the base closings. And I would hope the bill would provide for that.

I would also just like to clarify because Mr. Murphy picked up my figure, I hope I said, and if I did not, I wish to say as I have visited these units and studied their creation, I arrived at a private conclusion, the list still not to be revealed, of 20 units that did not fulfill the criteria.

I find the National Park Service is so adept at management, so good at interpretation, that it frequently turns a sow's ear into a

silk purse. And were I to return to those units today, I would not have a list of 20 but should be struck because five or six, though I thought them unworthy, have been rendered so educationally valuable that I would want to retain them. So I have no extensive list as such.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you. Mr. Murphy, did you want to respond to Mr. Vento's comments?

Mr. MURPHY. The comment is Congressman Vento mentioned the State and national park relationship. I think it is maybe important to insert here and to pick up on something that Dr. Winks said earlier, and that is that those parks that are really of national significance have clearly been recognized as such by the States and especially by the State of California going back to us originally transferring Yosemite back to the Federal Government.

I mean, I think that States recognize that certain areas are of national significance, and those areas should remain with the national parks. And where the State of California is concerned, we would certainly support the continued management of those areas in the State of California that are of national significance by the National Park Service. And we, you know, would not advocate any transfer of those units for management by the States.

There is a clear distinction, I think, to be made between national significance and what is a State park, although the State of California uniquely has several areas and several units that are of national significance that now we manage in concert with the National Park Service. And that is what I was trying to emphasize as being one of the ways that you might want to look at finding economies rather than some of the more drastic measures that might be taken.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. McPherson.

Mr. MCPHERSON. One comment to follow up on something that Professor Winks mentioned. The legislation, as he says, does say these consultations, that is, of the Interior Department, shall also include appropriate opportunities for public review and comment.

It would be hard to overstate the importance of the openness of the BRAC process. We were on C–SPAN at every hearing. In fact, several of my friends said that they got tired enough of looking at me on C–SPAN to almost get rid of their cable system. But it was really vital that the country, and particularly the affected areas, could see the commission that was representing them as public citizens, private citizens questioning the military on why it had come up with certain recommendations.

How you do this in the Interior Department as Interior conducts this review and then puts parks on the list, I don't know, but I do feel that it is absolutely critical that the public have a lot of opportunity to see it and, in fact, to lobby. I do a lot of legislative work myself, but I must say I was lobbied more than probably you have ever been, Congressman, during that year period by groups from the affected areas and from areas that didn't want to be affected.

And that was vital, that they could come in and see each one of us and make their case before the final action which is in 90 percent of the cases to approve what the Pentagon wants to do and to close the base. But before that happened, they wanted to see it in public. And so, anyway, that appropriate consultation needs to

be beefed up, I think, and you need to work with the Interior counsel to see how access may be had, how opportunities may be given to the public to make its voice known about these parks.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you. We appreciate the comment from each one of you. If I may add to the statement of my two colleagues here, I agree with my friend from Minnesota that there is a different mission than there was on the BRAC closing.

But I think, Mr. McPherson, you really brought out an interesting point in the difference of this thing. If it comes back to Congress, then there is going to be a dogfight as to whether or not you could close it because everyone has that inherent burning in their bosom of, "If it is in my district, obviously, it is good, it is wonderful," whether it be a military base or national park. That seems to run into it.

Dr. Winks brought out an interesting thing on the Snee Farm of Charles Pinckney who was supposedly a signer of the Constitution, is that correct, and he also didn't live in the house. To the best of our knowledge here, he never lived in the house that was constructed. Was it *USA Today* that put the thing out that said it didn't have one person visit it possibly because it is in disrepair? I don't know what it is, but if you were asked the question and you were on a quasi-park closing situation, it would be a very difficult time to say, "Yes, keep that one open."

You know, we have these blanket statements all the way across the United States of people saying, "Don't close any parks." It is kind of an inherent reaction that people have when you ask the question, "Do you want more or less wilderness?" When they first look at it, they say, "More wilderness," before they realize they can't drive their 4-wheel-drive vehicle in it; they can't do what they did in it before. Then all of a sudden once they heard the definition of what wilderness really is, they take another look at it. And I think to a certain extent we are finding that with parks right now.

None of these bills that come out of any of our committees are written by God. They are just written by us puny, little fellows up here that do it with mistakes in them. But I do think if this one had more push to it, it would be more like the Base Closing Commission. And once it got to the point you were talking about, instead of coming back to Congress, it would go to an assembly of people picked by who I don't know, but that would try to be as objective as they possibly could.

And the eight criteria that you have, the first four being military value, I imagine the criteria that would be established on parks would be visitation and historic value and the natural criteria and things such as that. So this bill has though, in my opinion, pushed us into an interesting part.

And like my friend from Minnesota and Colorado, I guess I really want to comment more than I want to ask questions. But I just have to ask one for Mr. Murphy. Do your parks pay for themselves in California?

Mr. MURPHY. No, not entirely, and let me kind of give you a very quick thumbnail sketch. Our fees that come into State parks go into a State Park and Recreation Fund, and that fund supplies, oh, approximately 50 percent of the cost of the operation of the parks. And then we get special funds and reimbursable funds as well.

And what we are doing right now under performance-based budgeting is working toward—in a very systematic fashion, we are working toward self-sufficiency through all of the programs that I mentioned and through a multifaceted approach. But some of the park units pay for themselves entirely and some don't. I think the most significant number you need to hear is we have gone from 80 percent support from the general fund down to roughly 40 percent that comes from the general fund. No, I am sorry, that is wrong. It is more like 24 percent that comes from the general fund.

Mr. HANSEN. So the balance comes from the entrance fees, whatever fees you may assess?

Mr. MURPHY. The balance comes from entrance fees, concession fees, and some special reimbursable funds and some one-time funding that we get from other funds—harbors and watercraft funds and the like.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Murphy, as you listened to the other panel, one of the issues of infrastructure came up from former Director Ridenour that the national parks are suffering a problem with infrastructure. What about your parks?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes. We have approximately, and it is going up every year, a $30 million backlog in what we call facility maintenance or infrastructure types of things. And this Administration has primarily focused on redressing that problem. The land acquisition for right now is merely concentrated on inholdings, cleaning up inholdings in lands that are contiguous to the State parks. And we are beginning to address our problems of infrastructure backlog in the State of California.

Mr. HANSEN. How many State parks do you have in California, may I ask?

Mr. MURPHY. There are approximately 270 individual units in the State of California, 1.3 million acres and 270 individual units.

Mr. HANSEN. Is the criteria for a State park much different from the Federal park?

Mr. MURPHY. No, it really isn't. In fact, some of the same criteria for establishing California State parks were used—we used the national park criteria in establishing the State park system as well. What we do that may be a little bit different, and I don't pretend to know all of the details of the National Park Service, we divide our parks into various types of units ranging from State wildernesses and State seashores all the way to State recreational areas as well as State parks.

The individual classification of these units, whether it is a State beach, State park, State recreational area, determines the degree to which conservation is given precedence over, for instance, recreational use.

Mr. HANSEN. Would you be interested in taking the Presidio?

Mr. MURPHY. No.

Mr. HANSEN. When you responded no, I assume there was a dollar sign right in front of your eyes?

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HANSEN. I just want to thank the panel. You have been excellent. Thanks, Dr. Winks, Mr. Murphy, Mr. McPherson. We appreciate your fine testimony and your patience. Director Roger Kennedy has been very patient with us today. We appreciate you

spending the time with us. It has been very kind of you to spend this much time, and we would ask you to come up and take the middle chair, if you would, so we can all get a shot at you here, figuratively speaking, of course. We have another hearing coming up so, Mr. Kennedy, we will turn the time to you now.

STATEMENT OF ROGER KENNEDY, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Mr. KENNEDY. Thank you. Mr. Dennis Galvin is here with me, and he has some charts with some numbers on them. I would like to do three things, if I can, in my 5 minutes that I suspect I better stick with.

First, I would just like to first of all thank you, Mr. Hefley, Mr. Hansen, and Mr. Vento, and the rest of you. This is a process that is enormously important to the National Park Service and to the people it serves. It seems to me this is the kind of hearing that restores your faith in the way that congressional government can function. We are talking about serious subjects and serious people trying to get an outcome which is a system that will work better for there to be conjoint responsibility between the administrative branch and the congressional branch of government.

As I understand it, what we are trying to do is establish a system, as you have all emphasized, and I would just like to run through it as fast as I understand it because I think it is a very good system. We vigorously support the following process, which I understand to be in the bill, that would protect the National Park System in the future from intrusions and from things that shouldn't be in it.

As I understand it, it would go like this: Congress would require the National Park Service annually to offer a priority list, not necessarily in numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, but in categories of what it thinks ought to be in the system. Congress would then decide what it is that is on that list that should be studied—spend money on it to study it.

Congress can always add something in if it wants to, but it will be inhibited in doing so by its own inhibitions. But the Congress would thereafter implicitly bind itself not to add units for which it did not authorize a study and for which the study did not clearly state that that park unit belongs in the system.

Now, that says that the administrative branch, which presumably has got some folks in it that are professionals who do this kind of work, has got to step up and state at the beginning of every year what it thinks ought to be in the system, maybe things it thought of last year—but tell you what they think ought to be in the system.

Then you go ahead and tell us that you want us to go ahead and study that one by one, and you step up at that point and say, "This is all we think you ought to study." And we come back to you, we have studied it, and then you say—and this gets very close to Brother McPherson's testimony—"OK. We have authorized, and now we are not going to put things into the system unless we authorize the study and unless the study shows a very strong coloration that it ought to be in the National Park System."

We think that is a splendid system. We are strongly for that. We think it will work, and we think it is exactly that kind of system to which you have drawn our attention, the absence of which has put us in something of the difficulties in which we currently find ourselves.

If I may, I would like to turn very quickly to just getting into the record some fast numbers with the assistance of my friend, Mr. Galvin, who is going to point to the charts because I do think since we are trying to build a congressional record here, it may be useful to get some numbers in.

Of the 78 National Park Service studies that have been funded since 1989, the Congress, through the appropriations process without National Park Service recommendation, started up 44 of those. Another 11 were put into the study process, not by the National Park Service but by legislation; not appropriations but by legislation.

Eleven of those 78 got in there from the National Park Service, and then there is the fascinating category of other, which is 12, which is influential congresspeople by themselves or in some cases, and worthy ones, philanthropy which says, "We would like to have you study this because if you study it, we might give it to you."

Of the 57 studies completed since 1989, the Park Service had a positive response for 20 of the 57 we were told to do saying they are qualified. In 12 instances, we said, "Nope, they don't meet the criteria." I am trying to respond to some of the inquiries here about as to whether we ever step up to our responsibilities. We recommended not for parks but for other things such as heritage areas, and we don't have time today to talk about that wide range of other options. They don't have to go in the Park Service—15. And then there is the other category which really means, "Gee whiz. Can't we study this some more?" which is a way of saying, "No thank you."

Now, of the legislative action on studies since 1989, this I think is kind of an interesting graph, it says—when we did studies, what happened? Forty-five produced no action at all; 10 produced a new park service unit; two went to heritage areas and other uses. So it makes a difference to have us do what we are urging you to have us do which is to study them carefully—assign responsible people to do that.

Now, finally, the question arises what are we doing to try to get ready for you if you tell us that you want us to come to you with a list every year. What we do is to send around to the System to the existing superintendents and other officials requests that they lob up suggestions or candidates for inclusion to the System. They are professionals.

Of those, we have had candidates, 58 of them, in the last call. We decided just to study 22 out of those 58 maybes. We actually got to requesting appropriations for 16. We got 12 of them funded and started, and of the lot, four were completed. So there is a lot of winnowing that goes on right now.

So I guess to wrap it up, and I hope I am still within my time, we are quite capable of doing what we are urging you to tell us to do. There are fine professionals in the National Park Service. There

are sufficient professionals in the Service that are willing to say when they don't think something qualifies.

It would be wonderful if your system and our system interlocked at the point where you said, "If we don't authorize a study, you shouldn't study it just because somebody puts heat on you to study it. If we don't authorize it, don't do it. And then at the end of the game, after you have studied it and if you are pretty clear it doesn't belong after the study, we are going to pay very careful heed to that in the Congress, and we are not going to force it on you."

I have, of course, other comments but—OK, sir. Thank you. Just a couple of very quick——

Mr. HANSEN. Go ahead, Mr. Kennedy.

Mr. KENNEDY. All right. I think it is awfully important——

Mr. HANSEN. We will give you another 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Oh, I will do less if I can, sir.

Mr. HANSEN. Schedule another 5 minutes for the Director.

Mr. KENNEDY. Thank you. I think it is very important to stress that visitation isn't the only criteria, and it is an easy thing to fall in to talking about visitation as the overwhelming criterion. If we did that, of course, we wouldn't allow for the increase in visitation that occurs as people get to appreciating places and that places become more accessible. There are a lot of places in Alaska that aren't visited much now, but one day they will be to the delight of the Alaska delegation which is going to find it nice to have tourists up there, but there is nobody yet—is an important point.

Second, a lot of us learned about national parks when visitation was enormously, astonishingly less than it was. When I first went to my national park, when I went for the first time, there were 53 units, and the visitorship was 3 million. That is when I first went to a national park. It is getting on to 300 million and 387 units. The visitorship if you took it and made your decisions today, you would make dumb decisions because visitorship shifts, and it has increased enormously in my lifetime. It has increased by 250 times.

Now, finally, with respect to visitorship, I am sure everybody in this committee thinks that the Frederick Douglass home belongs in the National Park Service. Visitorship isn't huge though—400 congresspeople might go over there and brood about black leadership for white people sometime. The Clara Barton home belongs in the National Park Service though its visitorship isn't huge yet because we haven't given that lady enough attention in her role in American society.

Hovenweep is one of the holiest places in this nation. It belongs in the National Park Service. Its visitorship is 24,000 brave folks that struggle out across those dirt roads to get to it. Isle Royale, which is where many of us learned about wilderness, has a very small visitorship. These are places that belong because they meet Mr. Winks's and everybody else's necessary criteria. So it isn't just visitorship.

And, finally, I just wanted to suggest that with regard to cost, that is a very essential question. You can't do everything. You should do the things you need to do, and that brings a final criterion in which I believe needs to be added to a final recommenda-

tion, though not necessarily related to national significance, and that is the matter of threat.

Yesterday, there were some recisions that came down. Recisions cannot and could not because of necessary speed take account of what will happen to one or two places that will not now be acquired, what will happen to them in the next 6 months or a year if they are not acquired.

The question of real threat is a significant factor that isn't related to broad criteria but is related to a recommendation to you not just that studies be done, but that after studies are done that something belongs in or out. So threat is a part of it too. Thank you, sir.

Mr. HANSEN. Anything else you would like to add, Mr. Kennedy?

Mr. KENNEDY. No, sir. I think we have heard wonderful testimony here enormously useful to us and I think to you. We want to get on with the creation of the kind of system that you want to get on with too that is going to fix this for us.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Kennedy can be found at the end of the hearing.]

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you. Mr. Hefley.

Mr. HEFLEY. Roger, again, I want to thank you publicly with hopefully not getting you in trouble with your boss, but thank you publicly again for the enormous help that you have given in this process. And this is a dynamic process as we have tried to work through and come out with something that works, and we appreciate your support for the part of the bill that you can support.

I guess I would love to have—and I would extend that invitation to your boss, to Mr. Babbitt, to come over and sit down and talk with us about this, not formally, but privately. I wonder if he was here, the question I would ask him, I think, is what would he have thought had Dick Cheney—was Dick Cheney the Secretary of Defense when we started the base closure or whoever was—I think maybe it was——

Mr. HANSEN. Carlucci, wasn't he? Wasn't it Carlucci, Mr. McPherson?

Mr. HEFLEY. I think it was. If Dick Cheney had jumped up when we started the base closure process and said, "Not on my watch. We are not losing a single base on my watch," and he would have said—I think Mr. Babbitt's answer would be, "Well, that is ridiculous. There are some bases that don't fit the national defense picture now," and there may be some parks out there that don't fit the national park mosaic right now.

In fact, in looking at your book—the wonderful little book that lists all the parks, one of them I have used as an example, Bruce, as you will recall, is Platte National Park in Oklahoma. When I was growing up as a kid there, even as a kid, I looked at that park, and I thought, "What in the world?" I had been to Glacier. I had been to Yellowstone and Yosemite and Grand Canyon, and this is a national park. And the reason it was even there was because of the mineral waters that were very important around the turn of the century.

I notice in your book, I was looking at it, well, Platte is gone. It is out of the System. But, no, it is not really. It has changed; again, a dynamic park system. It was the Sulphur Springs Reservation on

July 1 of 1902. It was redesignated as Platte National Park June 29, 1906, combined with Arbuckle National Recreation Area and additional lands and redesignated March 17, 1976, and then there were some more changes in 1940 and in 1976 and in 1991. So, you know, the park system changes too.

Mr. KENNEDY. We have plans, Mr. Hefley. I am glad that you raised that particular instance, and we will be delighted to talk with you more about that portion which Mr. Galvin tells me is now called Chickasaw National Recreation Area.

Mr. HEFLEY. Chickasaw National Recreation Area?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, sir. Good. That is an extended conversation.

Mr. HEFLEY. Well, let me ask you one quick question. The time element that was referred to by Mr. Ridenour that maybe this 3 years is too much time. Would you speak to the time element?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes. I don't think that Director Ridenour wanted to be taken literally on we could do it over lunch, but I think that many things can be done in less than 3 years. I am not commenting, of course, upon the efficacy of doing so, but I am commenting on the speed with which those kinds of studies can be done. Mr. Winks pointed out that it sort of depends on how wide an ambit you are talking about. If you are talking about boundary adjustments and intricate boundary adjustments, you would take more time.

Mr. HEFLEY. Oh, sure.

Mr. KENNEDY. But the general purpose to which you referred seems to me that that is an ample period—very ample period indeed.

Mr. HEFLEY. Thank you, Mr. Kennedy. I think I will stop there, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you. Mr. Vento, the institutional memory of the committee.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Chairman, you flatter me. Mr. Director, thank you for your testimony and pointing out the genesis of the studies. And I think, Mr. Chairman, it also should be pointed out that Mr. Winks spoke to Steamtown and to Charles Pinckney's home. The Park Service testified in favor of those particular measures before the committee.

So, obviously, the Park Service doesn't have a fail-safe method. The Congress doesn't have a fail-safe method. But, you know, if we wrote perfect laws, there wouldn't be any job for us. So we are far from writing perfect laws, and so we can go back and look at these.

I think it was true though that the study wasn't completed on Charles Pinckney. Almost everyone, I guess, just assumed that the house had been properly historically researched. So I think it was a mistake that was made I think in good faith on everyone's part.

I don't think there was any effort here to, in fact, mislead as far as the Park Service or the Congress in terms of acting on this. There were plenty of other times that we have been pushed into things that there is more debate about. The issue here was that we completely missed the boat. I think that is recognized.

But the issue with regards to studies that you were referring to, Director Kennedy, one of the elements of the bill that was of most concern to me, and I am glad that we have included it, and that is that the Park Service not have a series of options but that they

make a specific recommendation, a preferred alternative. So often we get four or five different options in terms of what can happen, A to D sort of options. And is it of a mind—you, obviously, are agreeing with this, but it hasn't been the Park Service practice in the last 20 years?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am adjured by my colleague and a veteran of the Park Service that I should be careful in my response to you at this point. Mr. Vento, it does seem to me that with respect to the fundamental question here is what belongs and what doesn't, there may be in that instance other alternatives where you say, "This is an important place, but this is another way to handle it," where you might have two or three options. But, in general, I do think we have to give you much stronger suggestions as to whether something belongs in or doesn't, and that is what, I think, is contemplated by the system. I think there is a lot of waffle in there, but——

Mr. VENTO. I think that the more clouded that that becomes, the more difficult the message is to decipher here. I mean, obviously, I understand that if it shouldn't become a park, it should remain as a nonprofit or there is a State alternative. I mean, what I am talking about is the recommendations which involve the role of the Park Service, and there ought to be a preferred alternative that you have and that you stand up and fight for.

If you can't stand up and fight for a specific proposal, I can tell you which one you are going to get when the advocate of that proposal gets a hold of it, and that is the one that actually ends up being the highest cost, the most Park Service involvement that gives it the greatest degree of status, let us put it that way too. So it isn't just money, it is the status issue.

Mr. KENNEDY. To be really clear about this, the language before us, "The letter transmitting each complete study shall contain a recommendation regarding the Administration's preferred management option," is just fine with us.

Mr. VENTO. Yes. I hope that the interpretation of that would recognize that it is not something that has been done in the past. We don't want business as usual here because that is going to be a problem.

Mr. KENNEDY. We are with you on this.

Mr. VENTO. And you agree with the redefinition of significance that is in here? Obviously, you have some concerns about giving up the autonomy. You know, there were some suggestions about the length of time here, and I think there might be some—my understanding is that this is almost a 4-year process as I look at it. Is that correct?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, sir. Yes, sir. I just wanted to heed Professor Winks's admonition that it sort of depends on what you are being asked to do, but 4 years is a very long time. Three years is a long time, and it seems to me that the period is ample and could be shortened some.

Mr. VENTO. There was quite a bit of discussion between Mr. Allard and others about the NEPA process, but we go through NEPA whenever we do a general management plan, don't we, for the park——

Mr. KENNEDY. Surely. I believe there may be some misunderstanding here as to what is involved.

Mr. VENTO. Yes, and I don't know that there is a concern about the modification of the waiver here in terms of facilitating what takes place. I don't believe that there should be, but I think that, you know, clearly the Park Service has the expertise to deal with the EIS and so forth.

I would just comment—one more comment, and that is some years ago after an extended debate, we asked for a restudy of almost all boundaries of the park other than just a general management plan. And the status of that would be of significant interest to me because it does, again, try to deal with the expansion and changing nature of parks.

And I must say I lament the reductions last night that took place with regards to the Land-Water Conservation Fund. I was listening to Mr. Murphy talk about the fact that they had some funds that were set aside that were going to be used for California. Well, unfortunately, we have done the same thing, as you know, Mr. Murphy and Director Kennedy, for the National Park Service. But the fact is that the Congress doesn't appropriate the money out of the Land-Water or the Historic Preservation Fund.

And, of course, the issue here has been one with the Park Service of an expanded mission—an expanded mission. And I think to some extent that needs to be redefined, and I think in this process and in this legislation may be the vehicle to finally bring that together considering the other elements like the Vail agenda and the necessity if it is being pushed by the dollar limitations. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HANSEN. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Kennedy, and thanks to all of our witnesses on the panels. We appreciate your patience. This has taken 3 hours and 38 minutes plus two breaks to do this. We appreciate you being here. It was very fine testimony, and this meeting stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, the subcommittee, at 1:38 p.m., was adjourned, and the following was submitted for the record:]

Statement of Hon. John F. Seiberling, former Representative of the 14th Congressional District of Ohio, to the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Lands of the Committee on Resources, February 23, 1995.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity you have given me to submit a few comments relative to H.R. 260, the "National Park System Reform Act of 1995". As a former Chairman of the Subcommittee, and still a believer in the importance of the National Park System, I continue to follow its progress and to admire its outstanding service to the American people.

The National Park Service is the preeminent Federal agency for preserving our nation's heritage of natural wonders and historic places. It has been successful in filling this role partly because through the years it has had strong bipartisan support in this Subcommittee and the full Committee, as well as in Congress as a whole. It continues to have the strong support of a majority of the people, in every region of the country.

Congressional action expanding the National Park System in the last twenty-five years almost invariably was in response to a strong public demand for more parks. Most, if not all, of the expansion was accomplished only after intensive study, public hearings, and debate both by the Congress and the Executive branch. That certainly was the practice during my fourteen years of service on this Subcommittee (1973-1986).

New parks created in that period were principally of two types:

One type consisted of grand, large wild areas like Gates of the Arctic National Park and Wrangell-St. Elias National Park in Alaska. They are truly magnificent parts of our nation's heritage and have been appropriately preserved for present and future generations to enjoy in their unspoiled natural state.

The other principal type consisted of natural areas in or near large urban populations. Some prime examples are; Chattahoochee National Recreation Area (Atlanta), Cuyahoga Valley National Recreation Area (Cleveland-Akron), Gateway National Recreation Area (NY-NJ), and Santa Monica National Recreation Area (Los Angeles). Each of these were found to

contain nationally significant natural, historical, or cultural resources. They also reflected a conscious effort to "put parks where the people are", thereby extending the the benefits of the system to meet the outdoor recreation needs of the millions of people who rarely, if ever, will be able to visit the traditional national parks. That approach can hardly be deemed inappropriate in a democracy.

The Act that authorized the Cuyahoga Valley NRA, the park I am most familiar with, was the product of many years of study, starting way back in the 1920's, when the famous landscape architecture firm of Olmsted Brothers recommended that the entire valley be preserved as a park. It contains more National Register historic sites than any other unit of the National Park System. Its landscape, an unusual mix of wooded ravines, waterfalls, wildlife, cultivated fields, and 19th Century villages, simply amazes first-time visitors. In 1994, the 20th year since President Gerald Ford signed the authorizing Act into law, over three million visitors used this park, according to the National Park Service. There could hardly be a stronger affirmation of its worth.

I recognize that the serious fiscal problems facing the Federal government necessitate an objective, "bottom-up" review of all Federal programs. It is the evident purpose of H.R. 260 to provide for such a procedure. The bipartisan character of its coauthorship, including the Chairman and the immediate past Chairman of this Subcommittee,strengthens this impression.

Nevertheless, I know that I am not alone in feeling great unease, arising from the political climate in which this bill is being considered. Some of the new Members of the House, with vocal support from ideologically driven outside organizations, are advocating wholesale deauthorization and even "privatization" of National Park units and other public lands. If that were to happen, it would be a real national tragedy, made no less so by being a political disaster for for some of those who brought it about.

To ease such concerns, I hope the Subcommittee will build a strong legislative history to the effect that the process to be established by the bill is intended to be an objective one and not a mandate for dismantling the National Park System.

I also urge the Subcommittee to add some positive criteria to counterbalance the largely negative ones listed in subsection 102(a)(2) of H.R. 260. Examples of positive criteria, I suggest, would include the following:

(1) number of visitors using the park unit;

(2) significant natural, historical, and cultural resources in the unit;

(3) providing ready access to the National Park System in a region that would not otherwise have it;

(4) value for educating about our natural, historical, or cultural heritage.

Whatever may be the significance of last year's Congressional elections, they most certainly were not a mandate to gut the National Park System. Americans feel strongly about their parks. They are not likely to forget or forgive anyone who takes them away.

Respectfully submitted,

John Seiberling

John F. Seiberling

STATEMENT OF JAMES M. RIDENOUR
PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR, EPPLEY INSTITUTE
INDIANA UNIVERSITY
DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, 1989-1993
TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS AND PUBLIC LANDS
CONCERNING H.R. 260—FEBRUARY 23, 1995

Not to be released until Feb. 23, 1995

Mr. Chairman:

It is with pleasure and two years of retrospect that I return to the halls of Congress to testify in favor of H. R. 260. While, on the face of it, this bill is about parks, in the context of today's debates in Washington, H. R. 260 takes on a deeper meaning. It flirts with the discussions of balanced budgets, line item vetoes and unfunded mandates.

While no one should operate under the delusion that this bill solves all the problems of the parks, it does sound a call for a return to sanity in the way parks have been and will be designated. This bill will not provide the four billion dollars needed to eliminate the backlog of deteriorating park infrastructure, but it will stop the bleeding, stabilize the patient, and, most critically, create a partnership between the legislative and executive branch to deal with the future of the system--a partnership that has been missing for a long time.

In a book I have recently written called, The National Parks Compromised: Pork Barrel Politics and America's Treasures, I point out that in a 10 year period -- from 1983 to 1993 -- the National Park Service (NPS) received nearly $1.4 billion dollars more than it asked for. That would seem to be an agency director's dream, but it wasn't. In most cases, Congress did not direct those dollars to critical areas of importance in the parks. Instead, they were directed to new construction and land acquisition not high on the priority list of the NPS, if they appeared on the list at all.

On a visit to Sequoia/Kings Canyon I saw raw sewage running down the gutters in the parking lots. I visited Yosemite and found a badly over-crowded valley in need of infrastructure improvements that would allow the movement of employees to less crowded areas. I visited Yellowstone and found deteriorating roads and unacceptable employee housing. I visited Independence Hall and found electrical threats to the building. I must hold the record for visiting sewage treatment plants in the National Parks.

I pleaded my case for funds to repair badly deteriorating infrastructure and the daily operational needs of the parks, but instead, Congress funded additions of marginal parks and more new construction. That is when I coined the phrase, "thinning of the blood of the national park system."

That is what has been happening and continues to happen. Additional responsibilities have been added with little thought as to how to care for the responsibilities we now have. We are stretching the abilities of NPS employees and volunteers to care for this vast system, and we are watering down the quality of the properties within the system. We are "Thinning the Blood" of our national parks.

I visited the director of Parks Canada to swap stories of our successes and failures. He told me they had similar problems and had decided they are going to designate a certain number of parks and then proclaim the system "done." Before preparing this testimony I called to check if Canada was still on the same path. They are. They have identified 39 regions of their country and are pushing to have a representative park in all 39. Their goal is to have this done by the year 2,000. Then their park system would be complete. That is an interesting concept.

I don't think we want to go that far. But, in my mind, there are few great "natural" parks left to create in this country that aren't already under some form of government ownership. An obvious exception to this statement would be the designation of a tall grass prairie park much of which may lay on private land. But, as we continue to evolve historically, we will continually face the need to designate historical and cultural parks. For example, we didn't need a park devoted to telling the story of our involvement with space until we had a space program. There will be other examples.

We should continue to designate new park areas. We should continue, but continue cautiously and carefully consider the best way to manage areas. In some cases it may be state or local government. In other instances the best plan might call for a not for profit or even a for profit organization to manage an area. The federal government cannot and should not try to be all things to all people.

One of the ways we proposed granting assistance and recognition to communities and areas desiring park status was a concept we called the American Heritage Area. I believe you passed legislation embodying this concept last year but it didn't make it through the Senate. It is an idea worth further exploration.

Our goal was to provide some form of recognition to local community efforts without going so far as to grant a long term federal relationship. Communities are often looking for help, but they are not sure what they want.

We envisioned filling this need by providing some up front technical assistance and/or federal recognition in some form. Our idea was to help local communities in the conceptual stages of their projects, provide them a form of federal recognition, then get out of the picture. Our intent was to not provide capital construction funds or land acquisition money.

I understand you are continuing to look at this concept and I think the consideration of this idea should be a part of any study directed to the Secretary. I would urge that this concept take a grass roots approach and that the impetus for such projects come from the local communities and not the federal government. In addition, now might be a good time to explore the meaning and purpose of "affiliated areas." No one is quite sure what affiliated status means—most of all the people who visit the parks.

I also suggest that any form of NPS recognition, affiliated status or other arrangement with local communities, be designed in such a way as to not be taken as a "Good House Keeping Seal of Approval." The traveling public should clearly be aware of who owns, operates and is responsible for the property and facilities. If you don't design this recognition carefully, the NPS will be overwhelmed by complaints of dirty rest rooms that are not part of the federal responsibility. Also, if this recognition is granted to everyone and anyone that applies, it will cheapen the NPS product. Careful consideration must be given in defining and granting any affiliated status.

89-593 O - 95 - 4

When I first became director I was urged to see a property that some people thought should be in the national system. I finally made the visit and found a very well designed and operated wild animal park. Many of the animals were non native and had been rehabilitated from injuries suffered in local zoos. The owner had put his life and fortune into this project. He was justifiably proud of what he had accomplished. He wasn't sure what he wanted from the NPS, but he wanted something.

He wasn't looking for money although he wasn't averse to the idea. He wasn't looking for planning help or technical assistance. He was looking for recognition, whether he realized it or not. He wanted the name of his park to show up on the interstate maps. He wanted it to show up in brochures about national parks. He wanted his life's work recognized.

Was the property of national significance? No, not even close. Was it an interesting place to spend a Sunday afternoon with the family? Most definitely it was. Did the member of Congress who was twisting my arm to visit the place really think it belonged in the national system? I don't think so. This trip was constituent services for him.

The point is that people who want a property to come under the umbrella of the NPS are usually looking for something. That something they are looking for is often money, recognition, or the desire to preserve and protect. Occasionally, it is all three.

The money problem is one that faces all levels of government. In a way it relates to the "unfunded mandates" problem. We all agree that parks and recreational programming have redeeming social values. Indeed, these places and programs are often an answer to trying to keep our youth involved in constructive activities rather than crime in the streets. But how do we pay for these parks and services when other problems are so pressing? When push comes to shove, the answer for local governments has been to turn to the federal and state governments for support.

In other words, if we had the money in the right place the NPS would probably not be managing beaches in the New York City area or in San Francisco. They wouldn't be purchasing the very expensive tracts of land in southern California. Why should they? These are not beaches or mountains of national significance. People don't hop on a plane in Europe to enjoy the great natural beaches of New York City or San Francisco.

Yet, these beaches and mountains are important and are locally-maybe even regionally-significant. Where should the money come from to support them? The areas are locally significant and should be managed locally. That is our system of government. Why has Congress become involved. I think I know.

It is a money problem.

The newspapers are full of discussions about Steamtown. Steamtown is a good project. Its roots are in history and its future is in tourism. It is a great place to visit, especially if you are a railroad or steam engine buff. Is it a legitimate national park site? I doubt it. Is it a good economic development project with tourism potential? Probably so. Would I plan a family trip from California to visit Steamtown? I might if I were a steam engine buff.

It is both a money and recognition problem.

In retrospect, the funding for Steamtown might better have been channeled through an economic development agency such as the Department of Commerce. Then we wouldn't have this confusion that exists. It would have had to stand the test of receiving funding as an economic development project rather than a national park site.

The desire to preserve and protect is a legitimate desire. If we don't preserve conserve, and protect our natural and cultural history we will fail to maintain our integrity. In failing to maintain our history we sow the seeds that are reaped in violence and unrest. We have had a civil war. We don't need another. So the problem we face in this example is defining national significance. Who defines national significance and how we do it is a major problem that has plagued the NPS throughout its history.

Too often it has been defined by groups of people with a very narrow interest in one project or another. On occasion it has been defined by Congress with the smack of a gavel. The NPS is not without fault. Given a mandate to make a study, it is the rare NPS planner that cannot wax poetic about the wonders of the subject matter—especially when goaded by the local office of Congressional staff.

This is a management, money and recognition problem.

H.R. 260 is a major step in the right direction to untangle this web and set the NPS on a corrected course. I applaud and urge the Congress to move forward with this bill. I would suggest a few amendments.

1. Under Title I, section 101. (a) (6), I would urge caution in the use of the word "preservation." This is a word that has a very specific meaning in the preservation community and I am relatively sure that Congress has a broader meaning by the use of this word than might be interpreted by many. A simple fix might be to add the word "conservation" in conjunction wherever the term "preservation" occurs. That would allow a more useful definition for NPS to use.

2. Under section 101. (c), I would suggest that three years after passage of this bill is more time than is reasonably needed for the Secretary to complete this plan. We are not talking about unknowns here. With the recent completion of the "Vail Agenda" and with the knowledge that exists in the NPS, this report can be completed relatively quickly. The public hearings will take time but still, I would suggest that two years would be more than enough time to complete this report.

3. Under Title II, section 201 (b) I would urge that you give a little more consideration as to what you want the Secretary to submit to you. In the language, you ask for a list of (areas). You may want more than just areas on the list. You may want theme studies.

For example, when I was Director there was a push to establish the home and studio of J. Alden Weir, the painter, as a national historic park site. I had no idea if it was a good idea or not. Was Weir the most significant painter of his time? How many other states were struggling to keep a favorite son's home and studio alive in their state park system? If we took Weir, what sort of signal were we sending to others? I know my home state of Indiana is struggling to keep the home of Brown County painter, T. C.Steele, open to the public. I notice that the home and studio of Thomas Cole is now on your plate for consideration. Was Cole more important than Weir? I don't know, but a theme study would have helped to shed light on the subject.

My feeling is that we should establish certain themes that we want in the system and then conduct thematic studies to determine which sites offer the best opportunities to interpret the theme. If you don't perform the studies, your arguments are weak when defending against similar properties coming into the system.

Possibly you might want the Secretary to present themes studies in addition to site studies on that list of potential topics.

Under Title II, "(c) "(1) I would change this to read "**possesses nationally significant natural, cultural or recreational resources that represent one of the most important examples of a particular resource type in the country**". This change would make it clear that a recreational resource must also be nationally significant in order to be considered for NPS inclusion. There are thousands of beaches that are significant but only a few are nationally significant.

Also, in the sections where you require the Secretary to submit lists for possible study as new areas, I think you should consider asking the Secretary for any ideas he or she might have for delisting existing areas. The intent of the bill seems to call for this exercise on a "one time" basis. Maybe it should be an annual process.

I thank you for your attention and congratulate you on this bipartisan effort. You will get lots of pressure to stray from this course, but the nation will be better served if you stick to this path of returning sanity and dignity to the national park system.

THINNING THE BLOOD

I have a growing concern that we, as a nation, are "thinning the blood" of our national park system. In using the term, "thinning the blood" I am referring to the problem of lowering our standards, being willing to accept something that is less than nationally significant into our park system.

These concerns grow stronger as I see so many things that need to be done to take proper care of our present system, and how stretched our personnel are to try to accomplish their work. In short, I am concerned that we are spreading our limited resources over a growing base and that, as a result, we may suffer the possibility of sliding into mediocrity rather than continuing to enjoy the prominence that we have long received.

Obviously I am not going to name any specific parks or park proposals here. It is not my intention to offend our Congressional leaders or our own NPS personnel. However, I do hope you will take a few moments after reading this to reflect on some of the additional parks—and the duties associated with them—that we have acquired during the past ten to fifteen years. Compare them to the "crown jewels" with which we long have been entrusted.

In a recent meeting, my Canadian counterpart indicated that Parks Canada has a goal of completing its park system by the year 2000. That is an interesting concept. What could he mean? How would you *complete* a park system?

In a nutshell, he indicated that they have defined a number of major theme areas that should be represented in the natural parks of Canada. Certain types of topography might be one example. Areas of unique plant diversity might be another. Another might be certain types of complete ecosystems. They believe they have properly identified the theme areas to be acquired. Therefore, once those requirements have been fulfilled, the park system of Canada would be complete.

Of course, he had to fudge a bit and admit that they would not expect the historical and cultural parks to be complete as each day puts down a new element of history and culture to be considered for possible future park status.

It is an interesting concept—to complete something. I had a similar experience in my home state that involved nature preserves. We had done our homework, inventorying the state's natural resources. We became convinced that we knew what was worth saving and that we could accurately predict which of these valuable resources would be gone if we didn't act quickly. Working with The Nature Conservancy, we went to the legislature and laid our story out.

Our story was that we needed to acquire certain areas and that once we had acquired them our nature preserve system would be complete. Their response was disbelief. They asked, 'Do you mean you wouldn't be coming back to us year after year, asking for new areas as you have been?"

Our answer was "yes."

They were fascinated by the concept and, after the mechanics of the plan were worked out, they bought into it. As a result, Indiana has one of the finest nature preserve systems in the country.

I throw this idea out, not as a possible NPS approach but as food for thought. I do know, however, that we can't continue to expand the system indefinitely. There are limits. As far as I'm aware, no one has ever run the 100-yard dash in nothing flat. In the same way, we can't transform the whole of the United States into a national park.

That doesn't mean that we should quit looking for new areas. It does mean that these areas should undergo rigorous examination prior to being proposed for inclusion. I would not want to see our "crown jewels" suffer further deterioration at the expense of adding new parks that might more readily fit into the management categories of state and local governments or private management by individuals and organizations. You, at the grassroots of the NPS—whether in management, planning, science, interpretation, or any of the other important areas of park responsibility—can play a big role in these tough decisions. As you talk with local people or Congressional members and staff, give them your best and most honest advice. To us falls the consequences of the possible "thinning of the blood."

James M Ridenour

JAMES M RIDENOUR
Director, National Park Service

National Parks
and Conservation Association

TESTIMONY OF
PAUL C. PRITCHARD, PRESIDENT
NATIONAL PARKS AND CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS, AND LANDS
ON
H.R. 260, THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM REFORM ACT
February 23, 1995

Mr. Chairman, my name is Paul Pritchard and I am the President of the National Parks and Conservation Association. On behalf of the more than 450,000 members of the National Parks and Conservation Association, I thank you for the opportunity to testify on H.R. 260, the National Park System Reform Act.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

I am very intrigued by Speaker Gingrich's remarks about the existence of a distinct American culture and conscience that must be preserved. That statement is profoundly relevant to today's proceedings. The National Park System is the repository of much of our heritage, and it is where many of the natural and cultural resources that represent our culture and conscience are being preserved and protected.

NPCA believes that, if enacted, H.R. 260 will be the most important piece of national parks legislation since the Organic Act of 1916. Therefore, we appear today with the intent of helping the subcommittee to develop a constructive approach to a potentially volatile issue. We recognize this process is likely to result in some pain, but we believe it offers an excellent opportunity to address significant problems confronting America's National Park System. That is why we supported a reform bill last year and why we hope to be supportive of a similar bill this year.

My testimony will touch on some of the overriding concerns that are addressed in greater detail in the attached statement. These more specific and more technical comments, as well as our broader concerns, have been discussed by an adhoc panel of park experts convened by NPCA. We also conducted several focus groups earlier this year on H.R. 260. For the record, we were pleased to have both Robin Winks, a former chair of the National Park Advisory Board and a trustee of NPCA, and Jim Ridenour, former Director of the National Park Service, participate in our workshop.

1776 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036-1904
Telephone (202) 223-NPCA(6722) • Fax (202) 659-0650

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

Because of the seriousness of the subject, we hope that today's hearing is one of several you will hold on H.R. 260. At the organizational meeting of the Resources Committee, Chairman Young said that the Committee would conduct field hearings and "go to the people." Because of the monumental importance of this legislation and its need for extensive revisions, we urge the subcommittee to heed Chairman Young's call.

THIS IS NOT A "PARK CLOSURE BILL"

Before we begin to talk about our recommendations, let us make a candid observation about media characterizations that this is a "park closure bill." No matter how hard anyone tries to "spin" the bill, the media will likely paint it as a "park closure bill." While we believe this is misleading, it is the reality we face because the media will view the possible loss of individual parks as the most newsworthy aspect of H.R. 260. But it is congressional hearings, markups, and floor consideration that will determine whether the legislation is a Trojan horse for an anti-park agenda, or a valid and meaningful approach to solving problems.

The media also will want park "hit lists," but we should strongly resist that temptation and allow the planning and review process to work. The focus should be on the only list that matters: the one that results from the National Park System review required by Sections 102 and 103. Congress and other interested parties ought to be working to ensure that that list is the result of a fair, balanced, and objective process. Such a list, we believe, will withstand public scrutiny and uphold the high standards of the National Park System.

Throughout its history, the National Park System has been steadily evolving. Its units take into account a wide variety of themes and resource types. The designation of a unit itself can say many things about the priorities of our nation at that time. This partly explains why many of the early parks were natural areas and why cultural and historic sites followed as we, as a society, developed our own historical traditions and decided to preserve more of the places that represent important components of our national character.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT

A major concern of NPCA's is the bill's exemption from the National Environmental Policy Act. This provision was not in last year's version of the bill. A NEPA exemption is both a fundamental and philosophical issue for NPCA, and is potentially a "deal breaker." We want the process to succeed and its recommendations to be made in a timely manner. However, NEPA is the legal safeguard ensuring both public participation and the collection and consideration of all relevant information that will be critical to any decision to remove units, or portions of units, from the National Park System.

If the process is to work, it must have the faith and trust of the American people. We believe that will not occur if NPS or the independent commission does not have the benefit of the information a full NEPA review would provide. Without the removal of the NEPA exemption, NPCA will be forced to reconsider its support for this bill. We see the bill as an opportunity, and not a threat.

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM PLAN

NPCA supports the concept that NPS should prepare a new National Park System Plan. We view this as an excellent opportunity to establish priorities and a vision for a NPS that will define its role as the steward in the protection and preservation of our natural and cultural heritage. However, we believe Congress should ratify this plan before NPS moves ahead with the review of existing units.

NPCA believes that questions regarding multiple representation of themes and resource types in the system are legitimate. The role of NPS in managing these units should be examined and clarified. The duplication issue, however, is more properly addressed by the National Park System Plan, not through the review. Let us first determine sensible answers to questions regarding duplication, then apply the results during the review process.

Finally, we think that this plan should also explore removing NPS from the Department of the Interior and establishing it as an independent agency. Too often, issues of park protection and preservation have been bogged down by the political agendas of the administration in power. We think this planning process offers an excellent opportunity to examine whether NPS would thrive if an alternative management structure -- similar to that of the Smithsonian Institution, Library of Congress, or Federal Reserve -- were adopted.

CRITERIA FOR REVIEWING EXISTING UNITS

Each of the existing units of the National Park System has been designated and/or supported by previous Congresses. Generally speaking, we believe that those decisions have been well considered and wisely made. We feel confident that the system will withstand the scrutiny proposed. Further, we believe that the review process should begin with a strong presumption that each unit is a valid one, and that the "burden of proof" should be on showing why particular units no longer belong in the system.

Therefore, we are concerned about the random quality and ambiguous character of the proposed review criteria. We believe that the criteria in the bill which will govern the development of the recommendations to remove units from the system should be developed by the Secretary as part of the plan required by Section 101. Congress should then codify these criteria after NPS presents them in the plan. The criteria currently in the bill should be deleted because they are too numerous, too vague, and in several instances, unsound.

We think that the criteria developed in the National Park System Plan should narrowly focus on a primary set of criteria, including national significance, and feasibility and suitability of the resource for management by the National Park Service. These criteria may need better definition, but we believe that this is best accomplished by the professionals of the National Park Service.

If a unit meets the primary set of criteria, then it is validated and should remain in the system. Those not meeting the primary criteria, would be subject to greater scrutiny using additional criteria, such as adequate representation of a particular theme or resource type. These secondary criteria should also be developed by NPS as part of the National Park System Plan.

We are concerned, for example, about the criterion described as "cost." Does this refer to the size of a unit's budget, its cost per-visitor, etc? How do you compare the significance of the site where Lincoln delivered the Gettysburg Address with the site where he was assassinated? Further, how do you compare today's operating cost with a unit's value in teaching future generations about our national heritage? Finally, do we want our generation to be remembered for knowing the cost of everything and the value of nothing?

Congress needs to look at the larger financial picture. Congress could best improve the financial condition of the National Park Service by passing meaningful concessions reform and fee legislation that directs revenues to the parks, and by stopping unnecessary "pork-barrel" add-ons to the construction budget in the annual Interior Appropriations bill -- recommendations we have repeatedly made to Congress. In addition, as last week's NPS budget hearing illustrated, NPS should prepare a more precise budget justification for the Congress to account for their needs and expenditures.

NPCA believes there are some other fundamental misconceptions regarding the legislation, especially that other federal agencies, state, local, or private entities will jump at the opportunity to assume management of deauthorized units of the system. Such prospective managers also have serious budget constraints; most are unlikely to have the resources to absorb additional management responsibilities that a deauthorized unit would bring. Without an adequate federal payment, the transfer of units is essentially an unfunded mandate.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A CITIZENS ADVISORY COUNCIL

We strongly recommend the creation of a Citizens Advisory Council to monitor the process and serve as a guardian for its integrity. This council should be consulted both on the development of the plan and in the review. If the process becomes overtly political, it will lose the faith and trust of the American people. NPS should be required to regularly consult with a citizens board comprised of members from statutorily defined academic fields and areas of expertise and experience. While it would have a role limited to consultation, it should also be empowered to vote on the approval of the reports or recommendations prior to their transmittal to the Congress.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND CONSULTATION

The provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act too often are cumbersome, and are a barrier to public participation. To expedite the consultation process and more easily open it for broader public participation, NPCA recommends that the bill waive the Federal Advisory Committee Act with regard to the bill's consultation provisions. However, we believe that FACA should apply to the Citizens Advisory Council that NPCA recommends be established to assist in the planning and review process.

CONTINUED DESIGNATION OF NEW AREAS

Congress must recognize that there now exist nationally significant resources that have been identified as worthy additions to the National Park System. For example, the tallgrass prairie ecosystem, which once encompassed 140 million acres of land, is a notable missing element of the system. A site that has been studied by NPS and found nationally significant, suitable, and feasible for a tallgrass prairie unit is located in the Flint Hills of Kansas. Congress must not use this legislation as an excuse to halt consideration of worthy potential parks for inclusion in the National Park System.

While the National Park Service may devise improved criteria for new areas, it will continue to be the responsibility of Congress to govern. It is important that Congress follow the process outlined in Title II with regard to candidate parks and value the independent judgement of NPS professionals. Members must resist the temptation to pressure NPS professionals into making questionable assumptions, and Congress must resist their colleagues who will, inevitably, try to circumvent the new area designation process.

AUTHORIZATION

Presently, H.R. 260 contains no authorization of appropriations for the purposes of carrying out the Act. NPCA does not believe that this process, however needed, should take money from current park programs. Although NPCA has no firm estimate on how much the process will cost, we believe that Congress should provide a separate funding authorization. Otherwise, this will become another unfunded congressional mandate.

Further, should an independent commission become necessary, it will need its own budget. Such funding would also allow it to hire staff and retain advisors and consultants to fulfill the requirements of the legislation.

CONCLUSION

We have attached detailed recommendations which we hope will be beneficial to the subcommittee. Let me say that we believe that the American people and future generations will value your decisions on H.R. 260 if they are practical, bipartisan, and made in an atmosphere free of politics.

The support of NPCA, all Americans, and future generations will depend on the thoughtfulness and care given to the bill by the subcommittee. Therefore, we encourage you to approach this legislation with the care that the protection and preservation of America's heritage rightfully deserves.

NPCA appreciates the opportunity to testify and we stand ready to assist you as you undertake this important task.

STATEMENT OF RICK GALE, MEMBER OF THE BOARD AND PAST PRESIDENT, ASSOCIATION OF NATIONAL PARK RANGERS, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS AND LANDS, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES; CONCERNING H.R. 260, THE "NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM REFORM ACT OF 1995."

February 23, 1995

Mr. Chairman, thank you for the opportunity to present the views of the Association of National Park Rangers (ANPR) on H.R. 260, the "National Park System Reform Act of 1995." As immediate past President of the Association, I continue to be a member of the Board. I am speaking today on behalf of the new President of the Association, Deanne Adams. She asked me to pass on her regrets that she could not be here today, and hopes to be meeting with you in the near future.

The Association of National Park Rangers (ANPR), formed in 1977, is a professional organization comprised of approximately 1,800 National Park Service rangers and other employees from all regions, salary grades and specialties - including managers of many major national parks and central and Washington office divisions.

ANPR is neither a union nor a bargaining unit, but rather is a volunteer association formed to advance the ranger profession and support the National Park System and the National Park Service. ANPR limits its activities to the presentation of factual, impartial, professional perspectives.

The Association of National Park Rangers has long been interested in having clear criteria established and applied for determining the "national significance" of new areas to be admitted to the National Park System. H.R. 260 appears to be an effort to address this issue, and we commend this Committee for its interest.

Clear criteria for authorizing "nationally significant" additions to the National Park System, coupled with appropriations sufficient to protect and manage a new area, are key to maintaining the integrity of the System.

The danger of not applying such criteria and practices is the proliferation of new areas of less than national significance and the impact of such new areas on the integrity of the System as well as the operating budgets and staffing of existing units of the National Park System.

The approach in recent years has become increasingly "political" with standards for national significance envisioned by Congress back in 1916 being subverted by the need, it seems, to have some type of area with the term "national" in its title established in every Congressional District. This is not a new phenomena. William Everhart, in his book, The National Park Service, recalls that:

> "In 1916 alone, there were bills introduced for sixteen new national parks, which would have doubled the number

> existing. Fortunately, and perhaps proving the system, Congress passed only two, Hawaii Volcanoes...and Lassen Volcanic...; the rest of the proposed parks were fairly dreadful. In one three-week period of the 1920's, bills were introduced to establish High Knob National Park in Virginia, Nicolet National Park in Wisconsin, Yakima National Park in Washington, Killdeer National Park in North Dakota, Wonderland National Park in South Dakota, and eight more pieces of less-than-spectacular wonders scattered around the country. Claims are often made for historic sites, ranging from the purely insignificant to the hilarious, most of which are clearly worthy of oblivion.

Everhart also mentions that in 1922, then Secretary of the Interior, Albert Fall, was quoted as saying, "Whenever in the public lands I can find a pleasant place for local people to go up and camp, there I shall have a national park."

Sadly, Fall's urge to add "every pleasant place to camp," to the System has been replaced by the equally disturbing trend of the past several years to attempt to add thinly disguised revitalization projects in both rural and urban areas around the country. We are not dismissing the acute needs of the nation's urban and rural areas, where the NPS may have some role to play, but we do question attempts to use the National Park Service as an economic develop-

ment agency. Each of these areas bleeds off more funding and further dilutes the significance of existing National Park System units.

Mr. Chairman, more than ever before, the National Park System is threatened with mediocrity! To reverse this threat, two things must happen:

1. Congress must tighten up the process by which new areas are added to the National Park System; and

2. Congress must assure that areas, once authorized under clear criteria, are adequately funded through the appropriations process.

Therefore, we support the need to establish a comprehensive study process with clearly defined criteria for determining the suitability and feasibility of proposed additions to the System. As we understand it, the process outlined in Title II of the bill is similar to the processes for studying proposed additions to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers and National Trails Systems. These processes have worked relatively well for these systems and we believe could result in a more rational approach to adding areas to the National Park System. I would add a note of caution here, however. Congress must be prepared to discipline itself in making the final determinations about which areas should be legislated into the System.

We also believe that the legislative process must ensure that new areas are actually funded for acquisition, development and operation before they become new units of the National Park System. While we understand the distinctions between "authorization" and "appropriation," it is vital that the link between these two processes be established when considering new area proposals. Otherwise, we will continue to see new areas authorized without additional funding being provided, with continuing dilution of the operational abilities in the existing system.

Title I of H.R. 260 also speaks to the concern of "national significance" by establishing a process for identifying existing areas for possible termination or modification. This process, in order to be credible with the American public, must also be based on explicit criteria and standards which would clearly show why an area does not belong in the National Park System. Without such a process and criteria, we are concerned that the review of the existing system could end up being based primarily on political influence, or on narrow or parochial issues without fair consideration of the national interest.

Perhaps former National Park Service Director Newton B. Drury captured the essence of the problem when he said:

> "If we are going to succeed in preserving the greatness of the national parks, they must be held inviolate. ... If we are going to whittle away at them we should

recognize, at the very beginning, that all such whittlings are cumulative and that the end result will be mediocrity."

In this light, we believe that the preparation of the National Park System Plan as outlined in Title I of H.R. 260, generally meets this goal.

We do have some specific comments on the language included in H.R. 260:

- Sections 102(a)(2) and 201 reflect the possible pitfalls in establishing criteria for how resources are managed. If "lack of visitor accessibility" and potential for "visitor use" had been determining factors for inclusion in the System one hundred years ago, a number of our great national parks, monuments and historic sites might not be in the System today. What's considered inaccessible today may be very accessible 25 or 50 years from now.

The same could be said for requiring some level of local and general public support as implied in Section 201. In the establishment of many existing units, local and general public support were at opposite ends of the spectrum, and local support was often negative. This doesn't mean that the areas were not nationally significant and today are viewed for the most part as assets to a community rather than a liability.

- If the Commission called for in Section 103 is established, we believe that procedures similar to those established for military base closing decisions should be used by the Commission. Specifically, recommendations should be made to the President and the Congress, who would "vote up or vote down" the entire package, rather than vote on each component of it.

- In Section 201, we question the realistic use of potential park system additions listed in numerical priority. We could agree with listing additions categorically (i.e., high, medium, low), but it would seem that there are too many unpredictable, uncontrollable factors involved to have a ranked listing.

As Mr. Vento said upon introduction of similar legislation in the last Congress, "Considering the exceptional quality of our national parks, it is our obligation to ensure that only outstanding resources are added to the National Park System."

Please let us know how we can be of further assistance in ensuring that this goal is attained.

I would be pleased to answer any questions the Subcommittee might have.

STATEMENT OF
ROBIN W. WINKS, PH.D.
TOWNSEND PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, YALE UNIVERSITY

BEFORE THE HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON
NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS, AND LANDS

ON
H.R. 260
THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM REFORM ACT

FEBRUARY 23, 1995

Once again public events, financial constraints, and the bureaucratic desire for neatness in all things have brought to the fore the question of whether too many national parks exist, whether some lack national significance, and whether the National Park Service, during this period of down-sizing, ought to divest itself of some of its 368 units. These concerns are reflected in H.R. 260, bearing the title National Park System Reform Act of 1995. The apparent intent of the bill is sound; but some of its provisions are not.

The United States has the most complex and elegant system of national parks in the world. It has reached its present preeminence over a hundred years by experimenting, learning, and redefining methods and management policies. The intent of the National Park System is clear: to preserve and protect in perpetuity the finest American landscapes, the best exemplars of American culture, the most qualified sites at which the nation may commemorate its historical experiences. Whether park, historic site, or recreational seashore, a unit of the National Park System must be nationally significant.

A definition of national significance involves an understanding of the nation's history. To those who believe in the connectedness of all things, every plot of land, every mountain's majesty and, every Civil War battle site speaks of the nation's experiences, of its pride and its fears, and thus has significance. Clearly this was not what Congress or the founders of the National Park Service had in mind.

But today the question, Who does history belong to?, is producing enormous problems for those parks that attempt to interpret the nation's cultural and historical resources. Disputes at Pearl Harbor, at Martin Luther King, Jr., National Historic Site, or at the Smithsonian over an exhibition on World War II, reveal that important sectors of the public are unwilling to accept the presumably dispassionate and more objective views of scholars or bureaucrats. The bill before Congress seems to be an attempt to deal with both the confusion arising over debates about national significance and to protect the park service from being the object of rampant 'pork barrel' politics.

The National Park Service was created in 1916 by an act which often is said to have presented the service with a "contradictory mandate." The service was directed "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life within each park and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

There is, in fact, no contradictory mandate. I have completed a legislative history of the act, going well beyond the customary history (which is usually limited to congressional debates, draft legislation, transcripts of hearings, and other congressional documents) to examine the surviving private papers of every member of every House and Senate committee that worked on the legislation. It is clear that Congress intended the dual mandate--"to conserve" and "to provide for the enjoyment"-- to be read in order of priorities. If the second charge came into conflict with the first, it was the protection of the resource that took precedence.

Of course, over the years a number of different types of units have been included in the park system. For some, recreation is their primary purpose. All limits, however, are expected to have national significance. This significance may be quite subtle and not immediately apparent to a less-than-informed visitor: protected fossil beds, complex and unique though not visually striking archaeological sites, structures and places that preserve the memory of an historical movement not yet completed. Through interpretation at the site and in publications, the park service is responsible for illustrating and verifying the national significance of the unit while protecting the resource.

By and large the park service has been skilled at fending off unworthy units. During the 1930s, more than a hundred proposals were put forth, and dozens of bills were introduced in Congress by representatives who had been persuaded, often by a local chamber of commerce, that this or that local landmark or museum should be added to the system. Senator Albert B. Fall of New Mexico strove mightily for the All-Year-Round National Park, a site to consist of minor recreational areas around his ranch.

Over the years, communities eager to push a local attraction onto the federal taxpayer have proposed various watering holes, cemeteries, agricultural museums, fenced wildlife parks, abandoned short-line railroads, and even a petting zoo for inclusion in the system. With knowledgeable friends in Congress who understand and cherish the purposes of the National Park System, the service usually has been able to avoid being turned into a series of federally subsidized sandlots.

Unfortunately, this is not always the case. Since the creation of a national park flows from the political process, the end result of a national park is what Congress determines it to be. Some legislators may think the park system merely a random collection of places, and do not themselves fully understand the importance of the criteria for national significance. If a substantial number of unworthy units exists--if, as former park service Director James M. Ridenour has put it, a "thinning of the blood" has occurred--it is Congress that must be held responsible.

Seldom has the Park Service sought any property that failed the national significance test. Of those hundred and more proposals put to it in the 1930s, only 10 percent became part of the system. The others most frequently were turned away with the judgment that the proposed area lacked national significance or that the system already contained a better "specimen"--a better cave of its type, a historic site that more fully represented the Westward movement. In fact, as more appropriate examples of particular land forms and historical activities were identified, the park service removed several units: Shoshone Caverns in Wyoming; Lewis and Clark Caverns in Montana; Verandrye National Memorial in North Dakota; Farther Millet Cross in New York; and 18 others. At times, with a unit thrust upon it by Congress, the Park Service even has turned a sow's ear into a silk purse through skilled interpretation.

Surely, units of the park system exist today that lack national significance, have little historical integrity, and are hardly accessible to the public. Perhaps such places might be better protected by another agency of government or through private enterprise. For example, few students of the National Park System believe that Steamtown National Historic Site in Pennsylvania is of national significance or can ever be made so.

As one commentator astutely observed, Steamtown consists of a miscellaneous collection of rolling stock, much of it irrelevant to Pennsylvania's history. A weakened and almost inattentive Park Service found this unit added to its responsibilities by a determined congressman who bypassed any historical review in order to provide within his district a potential tourist attraction that might help offset precipitous economic decline.

In the 1980s, Congress briefly considered the notion that every congressional district should contain a park unit. Congress also has required studies with a view toward establishing a unit for every president of the United States. Do Chester Arthur and Millard Fillmore really rate this treatment? Should Charles Pinckney National Historic Site in South Carolina be retained, when it is now clear that Pinckney never lived at Snee Farm, the focus of the unit?

Indeed, is the category of unit represented by the Pinckney site truly necessary? The Pinckney NHS was created when Congress decided that, where possible, every delegate to the Constitutional Convention should be honored by a unit -- a clearly impossible and undesirable step rendered superfluous by the creation of Constitution Gardens in the nation's capital.

Who is responsible in the end for poor units, or badly underfunded units? Congress seldom provides the needed funds when it adds a unit to the system, often against the park service's better judgment or contrary to its own studies.

The Hefley-Hansen-Vento bill can provide the means by which the American people, their representatives in Congress, and their stewards in the National Park Service can take a hard look at the criteria by which a unit joins the panoply of symbolically sacred places. It can be a time for declaring, once and for all, that protection of the resource stands above the pleasure principle in any national park. It can be time for revitalizing the ethic by which the nation came to have the world's finest, most intellectually elegant, and best protected system. It can be a time for moving forward in the creation of worthy new units, since the system can never be complete, as our understanding of ourselves and our culturally diverse development will make clear.

But H.R. 260 contains dangers. No precedent should be set by which a national park unit is stripped of its status which is not so richly particular that another unit might come under the ax. Your unworthy unit might not be my unworthy unit. An alternative agency should always be ready and able to accept transfer, for if a unit is finally judged not nationally significant, it could have such local significance as to become a superb state park. No one should produce a "hit list," for without the most careful examination of the legislation that created each unit, one cannot be certain of the original congressional intent. The act ought not to refer to "reform" as though it had prejudged the outcome; certainly what is intended is a complex reassessment. This is a process that cannot be rushed; many voices will have to be heard, and much education will be necessary, sometimes of Congress itself.

Particularly disturbing is the provision that requires the park service to complete its "reassessment" in only one year, which is more quickly than it can reasonably do so. If the service fails to meet the deadline, the bill calls for establishing a commission that will draw up such a list for modification or termination. The commission is to consist of seven members, two appointed by the speaker of the House of Representatives, two by the President Pro Tem of the Senate, and three by the Secretary of the Interior, one of whom will be the director of the National Park Service. Where are the dispassionate students of the park system, individuals who have no ax to grind, and no desire to add a unit in their state, in this process? Should not such experts also be on the commission?

Yes, this is a good moment to look again at the criteria, to seek to educate the public and its representatives about why it matters that a nation preserve its beauty, its historical and recreational heritage, its great natural landscapes. The purpose must be to protect the parks, to assist the park service in its efforts, already under way, to act upon the clear intent of the 1916 act, and to identify and acquire new symbols of our past. This bill, if passed, must be for constructive, not destructive purposes.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA — RESOURCES AGENCY
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
P O BOX 942896
SACRAMENTO 94296-0001

PETE WILSON, Governor

Testimony

of

DONALD W. MURPHY
DIRECTOR

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

before the

COMMITTEE
ON
RESOURCES

SUBCOMMITTEE
ON
NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS & LANDS
OF THE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

February 23, 1995

The Honorable James V. Hansen, Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

On behalf of the people of the State of California, Governor Wilson and the California Department of Parks and Recreation, I am pleased to have the opportunity to submit to you testimony regarding the way, under Governor Wilson's leadership, we faced challenges similar to those facing the National Park Service, and the mutually beneficial partnership we have developed with the National Park Service.

I am the Director of the California Department of Parks and Recreation, managing a State Park System which consists of nearly 270 units encompassing nearly 1.3 million acres of our state. Last year, 66 million individuals visited lands under our stewardship. We believe that we manage an eminently successful system which is second only to the National Parks of the United States in its acreage and diversity.

Three years ago, faced with a $20 million deficit and the specter of closing parks, Governor Wilson approved a plan that significantly reduced administrative overhead eliminating an entire layer of administration and a reduction of 183 positions. This action saved California tax payers $10 million. All this was accomplished without closing a single park.

Governor Wilson also directed the California State Parks to divest itself of parks that are not of statewide significance. We were able to transfer units to city and county governments and enter into operating agreements. We were further challenge to form public and private partnerships and to become more entrepreneurial in our management of California's State Parks. Toward this end we have developed an aggressive marketing and public relations program. This program includes the opening of state park stores in several locations across the state, public service announcements by state park spokesperson, Clint Eastwood, and development of park merchandise which is sold by catalog and in our stores.

We have developed a sponsorship program patterned after the successfully 1984 Los Angeles Olympics. The sponsors will pay a fee to California State Parks for being an official sponsor. We are negotiating our first large sponsorship with a national beverage company.

Governor Wilson also designated State Parks to participate in a pilot program in performanced based budgeting. As a result the department has developed a strategic plan with clear goals and tactics for achieving the goals. This includes an analysis of the services we provide and to what standard. This system of budgeting insures that we clearly define our mission, and that we stick to that mission.

The formation of bioregions has allowed the department to partner with agencies such as BLM, the US Forest Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service. These partnerships emphasize management of resources by ecological systems rather than by jurisdictions. Many economies have been realized as a result.

Our most significant partnership has been with the National Park Service.

An Overview and History

Throughout the history of California's State Park System, its management policy, administrative philosophy and goals have closely paralleled those of the National Park Service (NPS). Individuals imbued with the park philosophy include luminaries such as Steven Mather, who have advised both park systems at critical moments in our mutual development. Two of my predecessors, Newton Drury and William Penn Mott, Jr., have subsequently served as Director of the National Park Service. The California Department of Parks and Recreation and the National Park Service have a long history of working together. For instance, in 1921, then Field Deputy Director of the National Parks, and later Director, Stanley Albright advised the Governor of the State of California that he supported "state action on (redwood park acquisition which) would pave the way for a federal appropriation (and would constitute) the first step toward the ultimate establishment of a national redwood park further north." More recently, state park units such as those at the Marin Headlands, Stinson Beach and our historic ship collection have been transferred as building blocks to create the Golden Gate National Recreation Area.

Redwood National and State Parks

In this tradition, beginning in May 1993, discussions between Stanley Albright, Jr., the National Park Service's Western Region Director, and me led to a decision to explore potential joint operational improvements and cost savings that might be achieved between adjacent state and national park units.

This initiative was undertaken as a result of public comment received in the spring of 1993, during the California State Park and Recreation Commission's statewide public workshops on the status of California's park and recreation needs. It was also partially in response to a proposal by NPS for a temporary transfer of management responsibilities for the three state park units within the Congressionally authorized boundary of Redwood National Park.

In 1968 when Congress authorized what ultimately has become the 106,000 acre Redwood National Park, it made provisions for accepting by donation any or all of the over 30,000 acres of Jedediah Smith, Prairie Creek and Del Norte Coast Redwoods State Parks within its boundary, envisioning the potential for single agency management under the National Park Service. These are three of California's oldest parks, having been established in 1929, 1923 and 1925 respectively. In 1978, an interim management transfer of the three state parks to the National Park Service for a 15 year period was negotiated and readied for signature, but was not consummated by NPS for several reasons including the sudden increase of their responsibilities in Alaska as a result of an Executive Order by President Carter. In recent years, the possibility of a five-year interim transfer of management or fee ownership of the state parks to NPS was again raised.

The issue of transfer held a high level of local interest in the California counties of Humboldt and Del Norte. An article in *Smithsonian* at about this time reported, it was perceived locally that the federal government had not delivered on its projection for improved rural economic growth resulting from Redwood National Park creation and expansion. Projected attendance projections and daily visitor expenditures had not materialized (Kleater, Edwin Jr., "A New Park Saved the Tall Trees, But at a High Cost to

the Community," *Smithsonian*, p. 42, October 1993). In the face of very tough local economic times, the consolidation theory had been advanced by some local leaders, who have suggested that single agency management would accelerate public acceptance of the Redwood National Park as a destination, resulting in longer visits and more local spending. Unfortunately, this discussion was perceived by some other park supporters as a threat, and resulted in the creation of an adversarial relationship between the National and State Parks as well as their constituents, and heightened uncertainty and limited conditions for cooperative projects and management.

In the course of conversation over the Redwood National and State Park issue, both agencies recognized that they had units in close proximity in other California locations which could benefit from closer cooperation. This was particularly true, not only because of recent budget constraints for park managers but because park management focus in the National Park Service had shifted in the creation of newer California park units from a strictly "within the park boundary", single agency management approach, to an emphasis on empowering interagency and public-private partnerships both within and beyond park boundaries. Too, the rate of encroaching development has created an urgency to coordinate agency resources to protect joint park values. Therefore, both agencies agreed to initiate an assessment of operational efficiencies and cost saving possibilities where state park units occurred within some Congressionally-authorized boundaries. Besides the North Coast redwood parks, it was agreed to review the San Francisco Bay area parks including Angel Island State Park and Golden Gate National Recreation Area, and the Malibu Coast parks, composed of Malibu Creek, Point Mugu and Topanga State Parks, Leo Carrillo State Beach and Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area.

To explore the potential for increased cooperation, NPS and CDPR appointed the "California Coordinating Committee on Operational Efficiencies". Membership consisted of in-house park management professionals with matched representation from CDPR and NPS. The committee's charge was to independently develop and review the appropriate factual and intangible elements relevant to the efficient administration, provision of necessary common support facilities, resource protection and visitor management within the authorities and purposes for which the various units were established. The purpose of this process was to objectively evaluate the management of these park groups and to make recommendations for the best management of these units so as to maximize efficiencies for park administration, resource management, facility maintenance, law enforcement, visitor information, sharing of interpretive facilities, services and staff.

Generally, the committee found more similarities than differences in common problems and commitment to resolution. While differing levels of existing cooperation at each of the park clusters were observed, the committee agreed that greater to meet regularly and map out programs for joint interpretation programs, shared facilities, goal development and implementation would result in greater trust and cooperation at all levels of the park staff structure, and would provide better protection for each park's natural and cultural resources in a more complete context while improving the park visitor's information and in-park experience, and providing the best return on the taxpayer's dollars.

Following public review and comment, a final report was prepared. The following highlights cover the coordinating committee's joint agency and park specific recommended actions:

I. Agency-wide: The committee found and strongly expressed their belief that cooperation is most successful when it is formalized by written agreements between multiple levels of participating agencies, along with accountability measures. Agency level coordination is needed to invigorate park-to-park as well as agency-to-agency programmatic cooperation. From the headquarters level, through the park superintendents to the maintenance foremen and the trail crew bosses, all must be empowered to work together. But to be most effective at successive levels, cooperation must start on a day-to-day basis at the superintendent's level with positive direction and oversight from headquarters providing incentive and accountability. Accordingly, the following recommendations were made:

- The directors of the two park agencies should sign a memorandum of understanding which directs the superintendents of the three park clusters to identify and implement cooperative initiatives.

- Key program staff from both agencies should be brought together to address agency-wide cooperative initiatives including: dispatch for emergency response, 1-800 public park information numbers, visitor orientation training, concessions management, signage, park visitor information packaging, visitor safety, control of exotic species and feral animals, response to gangs and graffiti, coordination with tour operations, etc.

- In an effort to assure that the agreed upon actions are carried forth in a timely manner, a schedule of implementation was proposed, with twice yearly progress reports. At the end of a three year period, NPS and CDPR would conduct an analysis to determine the overall success of the coordination program and make recommendations for any corrections needed.

II. North Coast Redwoods: Consolidation of the three state parks under the single management of the National Park Service was considered by the committee to be neither necessary nor desirable. The consensus of the committee was that the condition of these parks is good to outstanding, with significant progress having been made in resource restoration and visitor improvements such that combined park resources and recreation experiences of all four redwood parks add up to an internationally significant park. However, federal and state budgets can fluctuate at different points in time, with federal funding levels healthier in some years and state funding faring better in others. On balance it was observed that the two major park agencies operating side by side have a larger, more effective voice in coping with threats and providing services with their combined staff expertise and support bases. Further, the three state park units almost pay their own way, largely due to entrance fees, higher campground revenues, and staffing levels. Consequently, it appeared there would be very limited cost savings to CDPR in turning over management to NPS. It was concluded that the financial reality is that park resources and visitor experiences will be best served by the most cost effective use of both NPS and CDPR budgets. Rather than transferring these parks from the State Park System, the committee suggested that focus should be on strengthening partnerships. In addition, it was recommended:

- That the national and state park superintendents should jointly prepare a memorandum of understanding addressing the management of these four units, with detailed goals and operating principles for the joint accomplishment of specific tasks including assignment of responsibilities for common park functions, resource management, road and trail maintenance, interpretive programs, signage, alternative visitor transportation, public information, maintenance, and additional recreational opportunities such as coordinated trail development and signing, interpretive programs, joint visitor center staffing and environmental education. Cost efficiencies should be reinvested in park operations.

- That a state park liaison, with management authority over the three state parks, be located at the Redwood National Park headquarters to act as ombudsman for state park matters and to assure closely coordinated operation of the four redwood parks.

- That resource management activities of Redwood National Park be expanded to include the three state redwood parks, encompassing the entire park ecosystem. A CDPR resource management liaison position will be established to work with NPS on shared resource protection issues.

- That an updated park-wide general management plan be prepared to provide an integrated blueprint for all four park units and the adjacent communities.

- That a targeted planning effort is needed to provide additional recreational opportunities and allow use of less accessible parts of the park within acceptable park resource carrying capacities so as to help fulfill the promise of the Redwood National Park as a destination park and stimulate the economy of the local communities.

III. San Francisco Bay Area Parks: Here the two park superintendents should convene senior managers and key program staff to pursue mutual initiatives with priority to stabilizing, rehabilitation and fund-raising for historic structures, removal techniques for Scotch broom and eucalyptus, and efforts to package and promote visitor service on Angel and Alcatraz Islands. In addition, it was also recommended that the Superintendents should explore potential cost efficiencies between other units in the Bay Area, including Mount Tamalpais and Samuel P. Taylor State Parks and Muir Woods National Monument.

IV. Malibu Coast Parks: The State and National Park Superintendents should renew inter-park cooperative processes to include program staff and the state's Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy. They should also evaluate a centralization of GIS functions, development proposal reviews, resource management functions, visitor information services, adoption of uniform trail, brush clearance and sign standards, and establishment of an interagency visitor center.

In addition to the above recommendations, each of the six superintendents had prepared specific cooperative joint efficiency and cost saving initiatives as part of thei

briefing materials for the committee's August/September site visits. These initiatives were recommended as starting points for each area's management interaction.

Results

A large number of the recommendations of the committee have been initiated or completed. But perhaps more importantly, the focus on cooperation has resulted in unforeseen opportunities which have allowed significant initiative on the part of the responsible field individuals who have employed the cooperative relationships to further the public's interest in ways unforeseen by the original committee.

Last April, I signed what might be termed a master or umbrella Memorandum of Understanding between my department and the Western Region of the National Park Service (please see attachment) designed to carry out the recommendations of the California Coordinating Committee on Operational Efficiencies for increased coordination and efficiencies between our two services. Specifically, this agreement adopts the recommendations of the Committee's report, authorizes the development of interpark and inter-agency agreements. To guarantee that this program is carried forward in a responsible manner, a system of oversight including regular reports and evaluations has been instituted.

In less than a year, we have made significant progress in the implementation of the recommendations. We have been most successful in the North Coast area, where we have established a CDPR Superintendent in the headquarters of the Redwood National Park who is responsible for interagency liaison. As a consequence, these four parks are jointly referred to as the Redwood National and State Parks and are so signed at their entrances. They have developed the suggested joint park MOU and a work program. Contact stations and visitor centers are jointly staffed, which has reduced visitor confusion and widened visitor opportunities. Cross training and development of a joint communications system has enabled the establishment of "Rainbow" Ranger patrols which allow quicker and more efficient response. Sharing of equipment, expertise and training has resulted in quicker and much less expensive development and maintenance of facilities. Coordinated response to a proposal to realign State Highway One through portions of the parks resulted in the he saving of more than 180 old growth redwoods and the initiation of a non-impactive solution which will save million dollars of both state and federal highway funds while improving the safety of these roadways.

Public acceptance of these changes and improvements has been high. Public complaints, expressions of confusion regarding the multiplicity of parks and available services have nearly ceased. The several local Chambers of Commerce seem to be pleased to have a single point of contact for coordination. Concerns expressed by the environmental community (which had been a leading proponent of consolidation) during the public review of the committee's recommendations has been replaced by acceptance.

The more disbursed nature of the parks within the San Francisco Bay Area has made coordination more difficult, but progress has nonetheless been made. Exchange of expertise and training opportunities in exotic plant control which plagues both systems has been particularly successful. Progress has been made in aligning law enforcement procedures, protection and service, development of a common public information resource

booklet has been initiated and special event collaboration has started. Exploration of potential cooperative events to celebrate California's upcoming Gold Discovery Sesquicentennial celebrations has also begun.

While hampered by the floods, fires and earthquakes of the past year, progress has also been made in the Malibu Coast cluster of parks. In addition to our state parks and the National Recreation Area, California's Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy is a full partner in the program's implementation. Besides many of the activities that we have seen in the other park cluster areas, we have seen the production of joint calendar and event programs which stretch limited funding and eliminate duplication. Particular pride is taken in the multilingual toll-free mountains park information service which is supported by all three agencies and is staffed by the Mountains Education Program. This service reduces the number of contact points necessary for public inquiries and expands opportunity for public use and education.

Conclusion

Faced with many of the problems now being addressed by the subject legislation, the California Department of Parks and Recreation instituted steps directed towards situation resolution. Employing a multifaceted approach, we entertained a host of ideas, including improving operations to achieve increased efficiencies.

A "park closure commission" concept may have merit where all available approaches are used in evaluation of the National Parks and which results in a multiplicity of solutions other than a single preconceived method. Park closure is but one part of an overall strategy of restructuring which must also include such methods as park transfers, internal restructuring, public/public and public/private agreements, and creative relationships with private entrepreneurs. We must look to all available solutions if we are to provide our country with viable parks, necessary resource protection and recreational opportunities into the next century for future generations of all Americans.

Statement of Harry McPherson
Member, Defense Base Closure and Realignment
Commission, 1993

I submit these thoughts innocent of knowledge about the specific issues that you are addressing, and uncertain whether my experience on the Base Closure Commission is of much help to you. But I was struck, on finishing my work as a Commission member in July, 1993, by how many people thought the Commission's process was a good one, and might be emulated by other commissions appointed to do tough jobs in the public interest. So I have accepted the invitation to testify today to share a few thoughts about the BRAC process and what it has to teach of general interest.

The BRAC idea has met with widespread acceptance in part because it was well thought through at the outset, had the good fortune to be chaired by former Rep. James Courter, a twelve-year highly respected veteran of the Armed Services Committee, and was superbly staffed.

Even more importantly, the work involved -- closing and realigning bases in the aftermath of the Cold War -- was universally believed to be necessary, and almost as universally acknowledged to be beyond the capacity of Congress to achieve. So there was a willingness to vest important responsibility in a commission of private citizens, and thereby to by-pass Congress when it came to control over specific base closures and realignments. It is probably fair to say that Congress was relieved to be so by-passed.

It is also important to recognize that the Commission was not asked to <u>select</u> bases for closure in the first instance, though it could choose to close a different base than the one selected for closure by the Pentagon. It served, and still serves, as an appellate court. The military services and the Secretary of Defense pick the bases to be closed and realigned; the BRAC Commission decides whether they did it, in the case of each base on the list, consistent with a set of criteria that the Pentagon and Congress had previously agreed upon.

In other words, the process was and is: agreement on criteria; selection of bases by the military, and referral of the list to the Commission; determination by the Commission whether

the selection met the criteria; submission of the Commission's approved list to the President, and then to Congress for an up-or-down vote. What the general public approved of was not the Commission's selection of bases to be closed, but its holding the military to a set of standards, as well as its role in bringing a painful process to an end.

We did our work in public, and we were heavily and appropriately lobbied. Our hearings were on C-Span. The country could see and hear, if it wished, how the services rationalized their choices. It could observe its temporary representatives, the members of the Commission, as we pressed for more information and challenged the military's data and rationale.

Your legislation provides that a Commission would be appointed in the event the Park Service fails to submit the report described in Section 102. Within a year the Commission would itself submit such a report to Congress, but the recommendations in its report would not be self-effectuating. It would remain for Congress to act or not to act on them.

This is obviously different from the BRAC process, wherein the Commission's list becomes effective unless the Congress votes it down in toto. I won't presume to say which is better in this instance. If the process envisioned by H.R. 260 had been chosen for the Defense Base Closure and Realignment process, we should have been back where we began, with the hot potatoes still in Congress's hands, and not much prospect of finality.

On the other hand, the BRAC process works because the country understands that bases must be closed, and that Congress cannot be expected to close them one by one. That anticipated gridlock has supplied the necessary public support for the process. My guess is that such a severe -- authoritarian, if you will -- process would work in the case of the national park system only if there was a similarly sobering appreciation of the need for modification or termination of Park Service management in many areas of the country, and a belief that Congress would be unable to respond to that need. Absent such an appreciation and belief -- and I have no idea whether they are justified in this case -- the political backing for a commission with BRAC-like powers is not likely to be found.

Thank you.

VLDC01-21736.1

STATEMENT OF ROGER G. KENNEDY, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS AND LANDS, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, CONCERNING H.R. 260, TO PROVIDE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A PLAN AND A MANAGEMENT REVIEW OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM AND TO REFORM THE PROCESS BY WHICH AREAS ARE CONSIDERED FOR ADDITION TO THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES.

February 23, 1995

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be here today to testify on H.R. 260, the "National Park System Reform Act of 1995."

Many citizens are concerned about both the integrity of our National Park System and the capacity of the National Park Service to do its job. The bill before us today responds to that concern by requiring the NPS or a "National Park System Review Commission" to identify parks that should be closed. There are also proposals to place a moratorium on the establishment of new parks. Instead, we favor reassessment of the criteria for the establishment of new parks, agreement between the Service and the Congress on those criteria, and concurrence that a process be put into place whereby possible entries that fail to meet those criteria not be imposed upon the system. H.R 260 offers one approach to that objective, but we think it puts too much emphasis upon looking backward. For that reason, we oppose it.

We support instead a forward looking measure which would give the NPS the opportunity to review its existing set of criteria for <u>future</u> sites under consideration for inclusion in the system. In

addition, we would support a provision requiring Congress to await completion of a special resources study for each site under consideration, before a Committee hearing is held leading to the inclusion of a unit.

This legislation comes at an important time for the National Park Service. To date, there are 368 units of the National Park System in 49 states, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Each of these units was established by an Act of Congress or by Presidential Proclamation and represents the initiative of Congress and numerous Administrations to preserve and protect our Nation's natural and cultural heritage and to provide for recreational opportunities. All of these units represent diverse public resources under our permanent stewardship for the use and enjoyment by present and future generations.

Efforts to preserve America's natural and cultural resources are longstanding. So important was the protection of certain special resources that several parks and monuments had been established and were being administered by the Interior Department by the time the National Park Service was established in 1916. Examples include Yellowstone (1872), Sequoia (1890), Yosemite (1890), and Mount Rainier (1899). When the NPS organic act was signed, 14 national parks and 21 national monuments were immediately transferred to the new agency where attention could be focused on these important

resources. The NPS organic act provided that the conservation of these and future units would be the responsibility of the National Park Service.

Since then, the National Park System has continued to grow. Through the years, the NPS and Congress have taken steps to protect natural and cultural resources. In the early 1900's, many cultural resources were threatened by plunder and destruction at the hands of pot hunters and vandals. As a result, Congress passed the Antiquities Act in 1906 to protect these and other valuable resources. Devils Tower and Petrified Forest, both established in 1906, exemplify the success of this legislation. Next, recognizing that historical areas were at risk, Congress passed the Historic Sites Act in 1935 to preserve historic sites, buildings and objects of national significance for public use. Most recently, Congress passed legislation to establish the Mojave National Preserve in California to protect transitional desert resources found only in the Mojave Desert.

Without these and other laws, it is possible that many of our nationally significant resources would be lost forever. Many resources today still remain at risk. Even though the first national park was established in 1872, America still contains natural and cultural resources that are worthy of park status and in many cases, in need of this special designation. At the same time, however, the NPS is trying to cope with new and growing

demands with limited financial resources. We recognize these challenges and continue to work to meet them.

Park Closures

Title I would require the Secretary to prepare a report which includes recommendations for closing parks. This report also would include recommendations regarding alternative management by an entity or entities other than the Service.

During the past several months, I have read letters-to-the-editor from newspapers all over the country which have been written in response to the park closing proposal. The NPS has also received letters in opposition to the closing of parks. I am sure many of you have received similar letters. These letters express the concerns of visitors about the future of their favorite park, whether it be a battlefield, a monument, a memorial, a lakeshore, a recreational area, or a seashore. These letters assert America's affection for all units of the system. Each unit is a crown jewel to someone.

In 1970, Congress expressed its support for all units of the system as well by passing the General Authorities Act. The Act states the following:

"Congress declares that the national park system, which began

with the establishment of Yellowstone National Park in 1872, has since grown to include superlative natural, historic, and recreation areas in every major region of the United States, its territories and island possessions; that these areas, though distinct in character, are united through their interrelated purposes and resources into one national park system as cumulative expressions of a single national heritage; that individually and collectively, these areas derive increased national dignity and recognition of their superb environmental quality through their inclusion jointly with each other in one national park system preserved and managed for the benefit and inspiration of all the people of the United States."

This language remains as true today as in 1970. This hearing is a welcome opportunity to discuss the entire park closure issue.

We recognize that nobody wants precipitate action, and we all want reasoned and deliberate discourse and careful analysis. These places are all important, not just to somebody, but to all of us. And we all agree we do not have the money to do everything. Visitation to the parks is rising; many parks are becoming year-round attractions. In FY 1994, parks were visited by 265 million people. This number is expected to grow to 276 million in FY 1996. The entire system will continue to support hundreds of millions of visitors each year even if a few parks are closed or transferred out of the system.

It is worth noting that attention sometimes is focused on closing or transferring parks where visitation seems low. The level of satisfaction and amount of education a person receives from visiting a park cannot be easily measured. Nor can the level of today's visitation be an appropriate test to judge a site's worthiness for inclusion or remaining in the system. The NPS and congressional leaders of the past have intended that the system be broadly representative of diverse natural and cultural elements of our Nation.

I would now like to turn attention to what we can do to ensure that future parks meet well-established criteria for park status.

New Area Establishment

In 1976 Congress directed the NPS to monitor the welfare of areas that exhibit qualities of national significance and to conduct studies on those that have potential for inclusion in the National Park System. For the next several years there was a Congressional requirement that we study and forward a list of at least 12 potential new parks each year. In 1981 the administration proposed and Congress passed a bill and budget to eliminate that study program. Between 1981 and 1990, NPS undertook a few studies in response to specific instructions from Congress. Then, in 1991, the Service began once again to identify its own priorities, using a ranking system that considered significance, rarity, public use

potential, educational potential, resource integrity/risks, public support, costs, availability of data, suitability, feasibility, and special initiatives.

Appropriations for Fiscal Year 1995 are supporting 17 studies of potential new parks or other types of major commitments by the NPS. Seven of these studies are of areas identified by our own professional evaluations as high priority while 10 are being prepared in response to directions from Congress. Six of those 10 studies are in response to directions from the appropriations committees.

Our files contain more than 290 studies done since the 1930s on areas that have not been added to the park system. Between 1970 and 1990 only about one in every four of the 177 studies completed resulted in Congress passing legislation to expand an existing park boundary or create a new park. These studies did - and should - reflect the highest professional standards, offer clear findings on resource significance, suitability and feasibility, and offer Congress a range of alternatives for protecting resources within or outside of the National Park System. Furthermore, careful scrutiny, analysis and tight criteria are the best defense against expansion of the park system into areas that fail to meet established standards for significance, suitability, and feasibility.

Another way to avoid inappropriate additions that do not fully meet the criteria for inclusion in the system is to continue to advance programs which foster alternatives. NPS today operates several small but vigorous programs which suggest and support alternatives by means ranging from honorific recognition, such as listing on the National Register of Historic Places; to state and local acquisition and development grants from the state side of the Land and Water Conservation Fund; and direct planning help from the River, Trails and Conservation Assistance Program. We also encourage the alternative of establishing locally-controlled heritage partnership areas as a way to preserve specific landscapes and areas of local or regional historical importance.

Sustaining a flexible and diverse "bag of tools" to offer park advocates is one of the best means of maintaining the integrity of the national park system.

Title II of H.R. 260 would provide a way for the National Park Service to work with the authorizing and the appropriation committees to reach a common understanding of what areas should be studied for potential inclusion in the park system. This approach has been in place and worked well for wild and scenic rivers and national trail system studies. Likewise it would certainly be appropriate for studies of potential new parks.

Last year, I testified in support of H.R. 3709 which has been

incorporated into H.R. 260 as Title II. We recommend that Title II be removed from H.R. 260 and move as stand-alone legislation. As such, we would support amending this new bill to require that the NPS quickly review its existing set of park criteria, make improvements in them, if necessary, and forward them to Congress.

These new criteria would be used to prepare the studies of areas for potential addition to the system, as currently proposed in Title II. Congress should adhere to these criteria when additions to the system are under consideration, as they should and will continue to be. This process would eliminate the tendency to establish parks that have not been studied. Furthermore, adherence to this process would preclude the establishment of parks through the appropriations process or through authorizing legislation that automatically establishes a park. My staff is available to work with the Committee staff in this effort.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared remarks. I would be pleased to respond to your questions at this time.

I

104TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 260

To provide for the development of a plan and a management review of the National Park System and to reform the process by which areas are considered for addition to the National Park System, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JANUARY 4, 1995

Mr. HEFLEY (for himself, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. VENTO) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Resources

---

A BILL

To provide for the development of a plan and a management review of the National Park System and to reform the process by which areas are considered for addition to the National Park System, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Park System Reform Act of 1995".

TITLE I—NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM PLAN

SEC. 101. PREPARATION OF NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM PLAN.

(a) PREPARATION OF PLAN.—The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary"), acting through the Director of the National Park Service, shall prepare a National Park System Plan (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "plan") to guide the direction of the National Park System into the next century. The plan shall include each of the following:

(1) A statement of goals and objectives for use in defining the mission and role of the National Park Service in preserving our national natural and cultural heritage, relative to other efforts at the Federal, State, local, and private levels.

(2) Detailed criteria to be used in determining which natural and cultural resources are appropriate for inclusion as units of the National Park System.

(3) Identification of what constitutes adequate representation of a particular resource type and which aspects of the national heritage are adequately represented in the existing National Park System or in other protected areas.

(4) Identification of appropriate aspects of the national heritage not currently represented in the National Park System.

(5) Priorities of the themes and types of resources which should be added to the National Park System in order to provide more complete representation of our Nation's heritage.

(6) A statement of the role of the National Park Service with respect to such topics as preservation of natural areas and ecosystems, preservation of industrial America, preservation of nonphysical cultural resources, open space preservation, and provision of outdoor recreation opportunities.

(7) A statement of what areas constitute units of the National Park System and the distinction between units of the system, affiliated areas, and other areas within the system.

(b) CONSULTATION.—During the preparation of the plan under subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with other Federal land managing agencies, State and local officials, the National Park System Advisory Board, resource management, recreation and scholarly organizations and other interested parties as the Secretary deems advisable. These consultations shall also include appropriate opportunities for public review and comment.

(c) TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—Prior to the end of the third complete fiscal year commencing after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit the plan developed under this section to the Committee on Natural Resources of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate.

SEC. 102. MANAGEMENT REVIEW OF NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.

(a) REVIEW.—(1) Using the National Park System Plan prepared pursuant to section 101 as a guide, the Secretary shall review the existing National Park System to determine whether there are more appropriate alternatives for managing specific units or portions of units within the system, including partnerships or direct management by States, local governments, other agencies and the private sector. The Secretary shall develop a report which contains a list of areas within the National Park System where National Park Service management should be modified or terminated.

(2) In developing the list under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall consider such factors as duplication within the National Park System, better representation of a particular resource type under management of another entity, lack of significance, lack of management feasibility, cost,

lack of visitor accessibility, modifications that change the character of the resource, lack of collaboration to protect resources, suitability for management by another agency, and the compatibility of the resource with the present mission and role of the National Park Service.

(3) For any areas for which termination of National Park Service management is recommended, the Secretary shall make recommendations regarding management by an entity or entities other than the National Park Service. For any area determined to have national significance, prior to including such area on the list under paragraph (1) the Secretary shall identify feasible alternatives to National Park Service management which will protect the resources thereof and assure continued public access thereto.

(b) CONSULTATION.—In developing the list referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary shall consult with other Federal land managing agencies, State and local officials, the National Park System Advisory Board, resource management, recreation and scholarly organizations and other interested parties as the Secretary deems advisable. These consultations shall also include appropriate opportunities for public review and comment.

(c) TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the Secretary completes the plan referred to in

section 101 of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit the report developed under this section simultaneously to the Natural Resources Committee of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate. The report shall contain the recommendations of the Secretary concerning modifications or termination of National Park Service management for any areas within the National Park System and the recommendations regarding alternative management by an entity or entities other than the National Park Service.

SEC. 103. NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM REVIEW COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.—If the Secretary fails to transmit the report developed under section 102 within the 1-year period specified in section 102, a National Park System Review Commission shall be established to review existing National Park System units to determine whether there are more appropriate alternatives for managing specific units or portions thereof. Within one year after the date of its establishment, the Commission shall prepare and transmit to the Natural Resources Committee of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate a report containing a list of National Park System units or portions thereof where National

Park Service management should be modified or terminated. In developing the list, the Commission shall consider the factors referred to in section 102(a)(2). For any listed areas, the Commission shall suggest alternative management by an entity or entities other than the National Park Service, and for any area determined to have national significance, prior to including such area on the list the Commission shall identify feasible alternatives to National Park Service management which will protect the resources of the area and assure continued public access to thereto. In developing the list, the Commission shall consult with other Federal land managing agencies, State and local officials, the National Park System Advisory Board, resource management, recreation and scholarly organizations and other interested parties as the Secretary deems advisable. These consultations shall also include appropriate opportunities for public review and comment.

(b) MEMBERSHIP AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall consist of 7 members each of whom shall have substantial familiarity with, and understanding of, the National Park System. Three members of the Commission, one of whom shall be the Director of the National Park Service, shall be appointed by the Secretary. Two members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and two shall be ap-

pointed by the President Pro Tem of the United States Senate. Each member shall be appointed within 3 months after the expiration of the 1-year period specified in section 102(c).

(c) CHAIR.—The Commission shall elect a chair from among its members.

(d) VACANCIES.—Vacancies occurring on the Commission shall not affect the authority of the remaining members of the Commission to carry out the functions of the Commission. Any vacancy in the Commission shall be promptly filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) QUORUM.—A simple majority of Commission members shall constitute a quorum.

(f) MEETINGS.—The Commission shall meet at least quarterly or upon the call of the chair or a majority of the members of the Commission.

(g) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation as such. Members of the Commission, when engaged in official Commission business, shall be entitled to travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in government service under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(h) TERMINATION.—The Commission established pursuant to this section shall terminate 90 days after the transmittal of the report to Congress as provided in subsection (a).

(i) LIMITATION ON NATIONAL PARK SERVICE STAFF.—The Commission may hire staff to carry out its assigned responsibilities. Not more than one-half of the professional staff of the Commission shall be made up of current employees of the National Park Service.

(j) STAFF OF OTHER AGENCIES.—Upon the request of the Commission, the head of any Federal agency may detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of such agency to the Commission to assist the Commission.

(k) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—Subject to such rules as may be adopted by the Commission, the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as authorized by section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, but at rates determined by the Commission to be advisable.

(l) POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.—(1) The Commission shall for the purpose of carrying out this title hold such public hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence as the Commission deems advisable.

(2) The Commission may make such bylaws, rules, and regulations, consistent with this title, as it considers necessary to carry out its functions under this title.

(3) When so authorized by the Commission any member or agent of the Commission may take any action which the Commission is authorized to take by this section.

(4) The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(5) The Secretary shall provide to the Commission any information available to the Secretary and requested by the Commission regarding the plan referred to in section 101 and any other information requested by the Commission which is relevant to the duties of the Commission and available to the Secretary.

SEC. 104. NEPA.

The provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) shall not apply to the preparation of any report pursuant to section 102 or 103 of this Act.

TITLE II—NEW AREA ESTABLISHMENT

SEC. 201. STUDY OF NEW PARK SYSTEM AREAS.

Section 8 of the Act of August 18, 1970, entitled "An Act to improve the Administration of the National Park

System by the Secretary of the Interior, and to clarify the authorities applicable to the system, and for other purposes" (16 U.S.C. 1a–1 and following) is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting "GENERAL AUTHORITY.—" after "(a)".

(2) By striking the second through the sixth sentences of subsection (a).

(3) By redesignating the last sentence of subsection (a) as subsection (e) and inserting in such sentence before the words "For the purposes of carrying" the following: "(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—".

(4) By striking subsection (b).

(5) By inserting the following after subsection (a):

"(b) STUDIES OF AREAS FOR POTENTIAL ADDITION.—(1) At the beginning of each calendar year, along with the annual budget submission, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate a list of areas recommended for study for potential inclusion in the National Park System.

"(2) In developing the list to be submitted under this subsection, the Secretary shall give consideration to those areas that have the greatest potential to meet the established criteria of national significance, suitability, and feasibility. The Secretary shall give special consideration to themes, sites, and resources not already adequately represented in the National Park System as identified in the National Park System Plan to be developed under section 101 of the National Park System Reform Act of 1994. No study of the potential of an area for inclusion in the National Park System may be initiated after the date of enactment of this section, except as provided by specific authorization of an Act of Congress. Nothing in this Act shall limit the authority of the National Park Service to conduct preliminary resource assessments, gather data on potential study areas, provide technical and planning assistance, prepare or process nominations for administrative designations, update previous studies, or complete reconnaissance surveys of individual areas requiring a total expenditure of less than $25,000. Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to or to affect or alter the study of any river segment for potential addition to the national wild and scenic rivers system or to apply to or to affect or alter the study of any trail for potential addition to the national trails system.

"(c) REPORT.—The Secretary shall complete the study for each area for potential inclusion into the National Park System within 3 complete fiscal years following the date of enactment of specific legislation providing for the study of such area. Each study under this section shall be prepared with appropriate opportunity for public involvement, including at least one public meeting in the vicinity of the area under study, and reasonable efforts to notify potentially affected landowners and State and local governments. In conducting the study, the Secretary shall consider whether the area under study—

"(1) possesses nationally significant natural or cultural resources, or outstanding recreational opportunities, and that it represents one of the most important examples of a particular resource type in the country; and

"(2) is a suitable and feasible addition to the system.

Each study shall consider the following factors with regard to the area being studied: the rarity and integrity of the resources, the threats to those resources, whether similar resources are already protected in the National Park System or in other Federal, state or private ownership, the public use potential, the interpretive and educational potential, costs associated with acquisition, development and

operation, the socioeconomic impacts of any designation, the level of local and general public support and whether the unit is of appropriate configuration to ensure long-term resource protection and visitor use. Each such study shall also consider whether direct National Park Service management or alternative protection by other agencies or the private sector is appropriate for the area. Each such study shall identify what alternative or combination of alternatives would in the professional judgment of the Director of the National Park Service, be most effective and efficient in protecting significant resources and providing for public enjoyment. Each study shall be completed in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. The letter transmitting each completed study to Congress shall contain a recommendation regarding the Administration's preferred management option for the area.

"(d) LIST OF AREAS.—At the beginning of each calendar year, along with the annual budget submission, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate a list of areas which have been previously studied which contain primarily cultural or historical resources and a list of areas which have been previously

studied which contain primarily natural resources in numerical order of priority for addition to the National Park System. In developing the list, the Secretary should consider threats to resource values, cost escalation factors and other factors listed in subsection (c) of this section.".

○

VOLUME EIGHT
NEW PARKS:
NEW PROMISE
National Parks and Conservation Association

NEW

The preservation of nationally significant natural and cultural areas needs to be an ongoing responsibility of Congress and the National Park Service. Though the composition of the system illustrates the inability of government, under changing political conditions, to follow faithfully an ideal program through many years, and though the pace of expansion has slowed, the Service and the Congress still have an unswerving charge to lead in the assessment of new units.

Critics of new federal land conservation sometimes ask: Why add new areas to the national park system? The primary justification should be to preserve nationally significant ecosystems, landforms and sites important to our history to the maximum extent possible. If the system is to be truly representative of our diverse heritage, it still has a long way to go.

In 1972, at the direction of Director George B. Hartzog, the Park Service completed a review of the system's composition which judged the adequacy of representation of the nation's natural regions and broad themes of American history. This *National Park System Plan* concluded that, in order to achieve representation of all facets of American history, a minimum of 196 additional areas should be added to the system. Major gaps were also identified in the representation of natural regions and natural history themes, such as plains, plateaus and mesas, river systems and lakes, coral islands, estuaries, tropical ecosystems, grasslands, and eastern deciduous forests. NPCA-sponsored research completed in 1987 on the system's potential representation of major terrestrial and wetland ecosystems concluded that the present NPS classification system lacks "enough detail to be useful for surveying ecosystem diversity" in the parks. Even so, this research suggested that the national park system lacks potential representation of 42 percent of all ecosystems defined by the method employed in the 1972 *NPS Plan*.

Though the system saw continued expansion during the 1970s, including the tremendous additions in Alaska which addressed several of these gaps, the vision for the composition of the system is now obscured. Since 1981, only four new units have been added, and one has been subtracted. A formalized new areas study program has been terminated. In 1976, Congress directed the NPS to submit reports annually on at least 12 potential new areas, but appropriations for the annual studies ceased in 1981 after critics claimed it led to uncontrolled expansion.

1. Forty-six natural areas should be brought under the protection of the national park system as soon as possible. These areas are but a starting point toward renewing the Service's commitment to improving representation of natural regions and natural history themes. This list includes: Tallgrass Prairie (OK), Jemez Mountains (NM), Florida Keys (FL), Michigan Peninsula (MI), Siskiyou (OR), Great Plains (ND, KS, SD, or WY), Blackrock Desert (NV), Escalante Canyons (UT), Atchafalaya Basin (LA), Luquillo Forest (PR), Currituck Banks (NC), Mojave Desert (CA), Hells Canyon (OR), Big Sur (CA), Kauai (HI), Loess Hills (IA, NE), Sonoran Desert Pinacate (AZ), Lower Altamaha River (GA), San Juan Mountains (CO), Lake Tahoe (NV), Owyhee Canyonlands (OR, ID, NV), Mobile-Tensaw Bottomlands (AL), Nipomo Dunes (CA), Sawtooth Mountains (ID), Arctic Wildlife Refuge (AK), Mt. Edgecombe (AK), Mona and Monita Islands (PR), Two-Hearted River (MI), American Samoa (American Samoa), City of Rocks (ID), Cobscook Bay (ME), Connecticut River (CT, VT, NH, MA), Machias River (ME), Kings Range Cape Mendocino (CA), Mississippi River (MN, WI, IA, MO), Montauk (NY), Chesapeake Bay (VA, MD, DE, PA), Amicalola River (GA), Oregon Coast (OR), Gauley River (WV), Ruby Mountains or Monitor Valley (NV), Smith River (CA), Nebraska Sandhills (NE), San Rafael Swell (UT), Purgatoire River (CO), Blackwater River (MD) or Black River (NC), and Sweetwater Basin (WY).

2. The National Park Service, through its external historic preservation programs, the National Historic Landmark Program and direct management, should invigorate its historical additions, especially in the areas of industrial, labor, architectural art and ethnic history. At least 40 sites of national significance should be added to the system as soon as possible. Examples of key additions include: Wounded Knee (SD), Lindenmeier (CO), Taliesin (WI), Leopold Homestead (WI), U.S.S. Olympia (PA), Attu Island (AK), West Mesa (NM), Anasazi Sites (CO), Mark Twain Home (CT), Gray Ranch Casas Grandes Sites (NM), Caddo Culture Sites (TX), Trinity Test Site (NM), Poverty Point (LA), Cahokia Mounds (IL), John Deere Home (IL), Fort Robinson (NE), Landing Beaches and Airfield (Saipan), Salt River Bay (VI), Hagerman Fossil Beds (ID), Robert Frost Farm (VT), John Marshall Home (VA), Yuma Crossing (AZ), South Pass District (WY), Principio Iron Works (MD), Anheuser Busch brewhouse (MO), Mesabi Iron Mine (MI), Fulsom Site (NM), Zuni-Cibola Complex (NM), Truk Lagoon (U.S. Trust Territories), Levi Coffin House (IN), Thomas Cole House (NY), Jimmy Carter (GA), Richard M. Nixon (CA), Cape Kennedy Launch Site (FL), Bushy Run Battlefield (PA), Rhode Island Battlefield (RI), Walt Whitman House (NJ), Sharktooth Hill (CA), Willa Cather Home (NE), and Walt Disney Home (CA).

3. The National Park Service should revise and keep up-to-date the *National Park System Plan* completed in 1972 to reflect new additions, pin point gaps, and identify potential areas to fill these gaps.

4. The National Park Service should revise the criteria for judging potential parklands to reflect the possibility of restoring nationally significant but damaged ecosystems.

5. The National Park Service should maintain an inventory of potential additions to the system, periodically reporting to Congress under "Section 8" authority on opportunities to incorporate areas. Criteria for nomination to this register should be broad-based and similar to those for the National Registers of Natural Landmarks and Historic Places.

6. The National Park Service should examine the status of "affiliated areas." All affiliated areas should meet the same criteria for national significance as do regular units. The NPS should reassess the system to determine whether any existing units would serve the system better by being placed in "affiliated area" status.

7. The National Park Service should work with Congress to establish a standardized method of assessing the merit of proposed additions, which should include provisions for mandatory hearings before appropriate Congressional committees, and an NPS study of alternatives, with public involvement, prior to new designations.

8. The National Natural Landmark Program should be reorganized and transferred from its current position under the Associate Director for Cultural Resources to a new position under the Associate Director for Natural Resources. Both the Natural and Historic Landmark Programs should become the basis for adding qualified sites to the national park system.

9. The National Park Service should establish a new category of national ecological reserves devoted to a more comprehensive approach to protecting biological diversity and fostering scientific research.

10. The National Park Service should more vigorously monitor the protection of nationally significant resources, both natural and cultural, under management by other federal agencies, state and local government, or private interests. Such areas which are not well protected by other agencies should be considered for inclusion in the national park system.

11. The National Park Service should seek to identify and include within the national park system representative marine and estuarine ecosystems.

Congress should mandate a higher level of cooperation between the Service and NOAA and or the transfer of the Marine Sanctuary and Estuarine Reserve programs out of the Department of Commerce.

12. The National Park Service, and other federal agencies, should work with the other signatory nations of the Antarctic Treaty of 1959 to establish an international park on Antarctica.

When the National Historic Landmarks Program was established by the Historic Sites Act in 1935, it served to qualify and disqualify historic sites for inclusion in the national park system. National historic landmarks (NHL) are buildings, structures, historic districts and sites that are acknowledged as among our country's most important historic and cultural resources. Over 1,700 NHLs commemorate or illustrate important aspects of American history and culture. However, the NHL program needs revitalization. There is programmatic overlap between the National Register of Historic Places and the NHL program. Current monitoring and inspection procedures do not adequately assess threats to NHLs. Some landmarks ultimately belong in the national park system. A wide variety of NPS-initiated historic preservation programs also play a critical role in identifying significant historic areas and exploring alternatives to their inclusion in the system. Efforts such as the Industrial Heritage Project, which coordinates regional planning in western Pennsylvania, will be models for future action and will strengthen the Service's role as a leader of national historic preservation efforts.

The National Natural Landmark (NNL) Program has not reached its potential. It lacks personnel and adequate support monies. Established by Secretarial Order in 1962 and administered by the National Park Service, it was envisioned originally as a valuable source of candidate areas for the system. The NNL program identifies and recognizes outstanding examples of natural features, without providing for federal acquisition of the areas. Over 3,000 potential landmarks have been identified and 586 have been designated. At least 400 have potential as national park system areas. However, the NNL program is limping along on an underfunded budget without policy support at higher levels. Unable to adequately inventory, monitor, or protect these sites, the program needs substantial invigoration if it is to play a supporting role in the NPS new areas study process.

The whole category of "affiliated areas," which now includes more than 30 sites, needs evaluation. Affiliated areas, though usually not federally owned, are intended to be sites of national significance, but are not full-fledged units of the system. They have a vital role to play in the protection of smaller historic sites and areas currently protected by means other than federal ownership and management, yet there is still no set of criteria for designation.

Continued expansion is needed if the system is to keep pace with the continually increasing public demand for new parkland. From 1950 to 1982, total visitation at national park system areas increased more than tenfold, from 33 million to nearly 330 million. National Park Service statistics for 1986 indicate that recreation visits climbed to 281 million, a 7 percent increase from the previous year. The system might receive 450-500 million visits per year by the year 2010.

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
3 9999 05984 127 8

Selection of new park areas requires the utmost care. As the National Park Service has expanded from managing an initial core of vast natural areas into the management of a variety of sites, it has faced both good and bad proposals. Horace Albright, the second Director of the Service, wrote in 1930 that "promotion of unfit national parks must be challenged, since otherwise a spurious stamp of 'sterling' on local scenery without national distinction will quickly depreciate the value of the whole system." Indeed, designation as a unit of the system is to be held precious, since the value of designation is not judged by the best qualified unit, but by the least.

Federal agencies other than the National Park Service manage natural areas and cultural sites of preeminent national value. Dozens of designated wilderness areas, such as the Bob Marshall in Montana, the Superstition Mountains in Arizona, and the Eagles Nest in Colorado are of national park quality. Places like White Mountain National Forest in New Hampshire are commonly mistaken for national parks. Other areas have designations that confuse distinctions between federal land systems. The Forest Service, for example, manages Misty Fiords and Admiralty Island National Monuments in Alaska, Sawtooth National Recreation Area in Idaho, and Hells Canyon National Recreation Area in Oregon Idaho. Bureau of Land Management lands in the western United States contain fantastic—and largely uninvestigated—archaeological remains. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), an agency of the U.S. Department of Commerce, oversees two coastal zone management programs that target nationally significant resources: the National Marine Sanctuary Program and the National Estuarine Research Reserve Program. The latter has 16 designated estuarine research reserves, the former system currently includes seven designated marine sanctuaries.

The National Park Service has a proper and important role to play in monitoring—and where appropriate, managing—such areas. Though designated wilderness provides a high level of land-use protection, the need for vigilance never abates. Where Congress has acknowledged the national significance of an area, and where such units are not well protected, the Park Service may be the best land management agency for the job. Since the national park system has only a few protected marine areas, it is critical that the Service expand its efforts to bring more marine parks under preservation stewardship.

Over its history, the national park system has witnessed a substantial broadening of purposes, as the Service assumed responsibility for numerous historic sites, including such resources as battlefields, ranches, factories and ships, as well as urban recreation areas. Numerous units east of the Mississippi have joined the original core of Western parks. Also, Redwood, Shenandoah and Great Smoky Mountains national parks have demonstrated the feasibility of restoring partially damaged ecosystems. Parks such as Cuyahoga, Gateway and Golden Gate National Recreation Areas have led the Service into providing recreational opportunities for millions of urban Americans as well.

The role of the system continues to evolve. Growing environmental awareness has made it possible for the system to play a pivotal role in the development of the UNESCO Man and the Biosphere Program, and in the protection of biological diversity. In the future, the Park Service should take a more active role in protecting all significant terrestrial and marine ecosystems, through the establishment of a system of national ecological reserves.

Yale historian Robin W. Winks, a former chairman of the National Park Service Advisory Board, has said that the choice of national park system sites reflects the priorities of the nation: "The true test of national character is in what people choose, by conscious act, in the face of contending choices, to preserve. These visible symbols of the past, survivors of a fierce competition for national attention, make tangible the past that would otherwise remain obscured."

As development and other man-made impacts sweep across the landscape, time is running out to save the remaining outstanding examples of natural America for future generations; the nation will need to move swiftly to identify and protect the historic heritage of America. It is essential to afford the National Park Service an appropriate means of protecting our remaining—and emerging—areas of national significance.

ISBN 0-16-047027-7